[illegible]

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 108, NO. 4 NEW YORK, MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1943 NUMBER 1469

State Department Week

Last week was a busy one for the august Department of State. The mess in North Africa continued. Indeed, as we point out elsewhere, it was made still worse by the announcement that Marcel Peyrouton, once Marshal Pétain's Interior Minister, and so the responsible official in charge of the Vichy police who arrested de Gaullists and "communists," had arrived in French West Africa, on his way from the Argentine, to take an important post in the Giraud government. His arrival may not have been arranged by the gentlemen on Pennsylvania Avenue, but it is certain that he would have remained in Buenos Aires had the department made representations against him.

Our enthusiasm at reading that the Martinique radio has at last ceased its short-wave broadcasting of Axis propaganda was somewhat tempered by the statement, contained in the same news item, that Martinique's medium waves, available only to a limited area in the Caribbean, would continue Vichy broadcasts as before. Sometimes the State Department's concern for the sensibilities of our avowed enemies seems almost pathological psychoanalysts have a nasty name for it. They call it masochism.

Our Ambassador to Madrid gave the long-suffering Spanish people a dash of cold water similar to the cold shower our African policy gave the French when he assured them that our victory would not bring democracy back to Spain. "If the political and social institutions of this country undergo change or modification in future years," he said, "it will be the work of Spaniards within Spain—not of the United States or of Spanish emigrés." How the Spaniards within Spain are ever to be able to change the political and social institutions of their country without the help of the United States or of Spanish emigrés was not explained.

Having vigorously denied that our Ambassador to Bolivia had in any way intervened in the tin strike there, the State Department has now swallowed its own words by consenting to a delegation which will go to Bolivia to investigate and report on that question. The ways of diplomacy are often obscure to simple men, but even a simple man can see that the consent negates the denial.

The United States and Great Britain last week formally renounced extraterritoriality in China. The action is good in itself, but has been taken so tardily that most of its value in building good will for us among the Chinese and other people of the Orient has been destroyed.

A cruel blow at the department came from one who was once himself, and for eight years, a high State Department official. In a speech at Louisville, Hugh G. Grant, former Minister to Albania and Thailand, assailed the "career men who sit at desks in Washington" and said that the Department needed "new blood . . . if we are to win the peace."

We hope it is not merely the peace that is in danger.

How Much Synthetic Rubber?

In the present dispute between William Jeffers, rubber administrator, and the army and navy, it seems to us that the armed services are in the right. They want a 25-percent reduction in the synthetic-rubber program in order to permit the diversion of scarce

CONTENTS

The Week 99

Editorials

The North African Mess 102
War Thoughts on Labor 103

General Articles

Russian Offensive—German Crisis . Max Werner 105
Can We Afford the War? . . George Soule 107
Four Years of Franco . Fernando de los Rios 111
The Future of Liberal Education . . . . . Alexander Meiklejohn 113
The Christian American Cabal . Helen Fuller 115
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 118
History and Hollywood . . Manny Farber 119
Labor on Foreign Fronts 119
The Bandwagon 120

Correspondence 120

Books in Review

Europe: Death and Rebirth . Malcolm Cowley 122
Enigma or Logic? . . . . . Hans Kohn 123
Small Fry: Twenty Years Later . . . . . Diana Trilling 124
End of a Controversy . . Bertram D. Wolfe 124
A Reader's List 126

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1943, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

material for other purposes, especially for more escort vessels for the navy, and more aviation gasoline and explosives. Escort vessels need steel and other materials that would be used in building synthetic-rubber plants; gasoline and explosives need the same raw materials as rubber. The army-navy spokesmen say that the synthetic-rubber plants are proving more efficient than was expected and that figures on production are therefore too pessimistic. They say the continued very grave menace of the submarine makes more escort vessels imperative. They are willing to assume full responsibility if rubber is short. This seems to make good sense.

What doesn't make good sense is the shocking way in which the rubber in existing tires is still being wasted in unnecessary driving. All over the country except along the Eastern seaboard, people are permitted several hundred miles a month of needless use of their cars. Even on the Atlantic seaboard, such use was prohibited only a couple of weeks ago. In addition, careful studies just made show that millions of war workers are using cars when they don't need to. They drive to work although they live only a few blocks away; they drive home for lunch; they use their cars although there are trolleys and buses available. We are still throwing away our rubber as though we had an inexhaustible supply; and we may have cause bitterly to regret our actions.

They Lied

The new restrictions on driving, which apply only in the Eastern states, seem to show that many thousands of persons lied shamelessly when they applied for their ration books last summer. In theory, they should not have asked for a B or C book unless their driving was entirely necessary. Now, however, when OPA inspectors are likely to stop you on the street and make you prove that your errand is legitimate, the cars with B and C stickers have disappeared from the highway about as completely as the A cards—a striking involuntary admission of earlier falsehood.

Lynching Indictments

The indictment of five men by a federal grand jury in Jackson, Mississippi, on a charge of lynching a Negro is an important event in the history of race relations. The Negro was lynched last summer at Laurel, a town in the "piney woods" section south of Jackson. He had been convicted of beating his white employer to death with a water bucket. The Negro claimed self-defense. The jury recommended life imprisonment, but the Negro, Howard Wash, knew he was done for. He gave his child a dollar bill as a farewell present and told his wife goodbye. The next day a mob walked through the jail's unlocked "mob-proof" steel door, took Wash away and killed him.

Lynch mobs commit atrocities like this because they can get away with them. But now the Department of Justice has had the courage to invoke an unusual but obvious technique. They have charged the jailer and four mob leaders with depriving the Negro of his constitutional rights. Stiff fines and prison terms are the possible penalty. A leading Jackson lawyer is serving as special assistant to the Attorney General. Mississippi's federal courts will effect a monumental achievement if they follow this case through to convictions. It will be a shameful disappointment if the case is allowed to bog down. There have been only two previous indictments by federal grand juries in lynching cases, the last returned in Alabama in 1903, but never tried because a demurrer was sustained in the United States Supreme Court.

Carlo Tresca's Murderers

Thousands of people felt deeply moved when they heard that Carlo Tresca was dead. He was courageous and sincere, besides being full of laughter and good stories told in an outrageous dialect; and whatever one thought of his political opinions, one couldn't help thinking that he was one's friend. About the question of who was responsible for his murder, we know exactly as much as the public at large, and not much less, it would seem, than the police. It was obviously a well planned political crime, although it may have been carried out by hired thugs. Crimes of that sort are usually the work of the fascists, and Tresca had long ago been threatened with death by Mussolini's agents. He was also a bitter enemy of the Communists, but we doubt that they would choose that particular revenge at this particular time. The American Communists are not much given to deeds of violence, except for occasional inter-union beatings, while the Russian secret service, which has committed political murders in the past—like that of Ignatz Reiss in Switzerland and probably that of Trotsky—is at present not anxious to stir up trouble in friendly countries. What we do know is that after reading for years about plots and political assassinations, and after believing that they were a feature of life in autocratic or backward countries, we now discover that they can happen here too. We hope they do not happen again, and that no secret society of assassins, no Fehme or Hooded Men, will be permitted to flourish here.

A New European Council

The Free World Association has taken a step which may prove of much importance, in creating a European Council to match its existing Latin American and Asiatic ones. The new European group, representative of thirty-three nations, will devote its efforts to political warfare against the Axis, so that the forthcoming invasion of Europe may be given all possible assistance. Its four divisions, for political affairs, European organization, economic reconstruction and education, are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

headed by Alvarez del Vayo, Gen. Julius Deutsch, G. F. Van Dissel and Henri Bonnet. We hope the European Council will go to work at once on the North African political mess, by far the most serious matter now affecting subjugated Europe.

A Black Eye for the Chicago Set

The "Chicago set," as The New York Herald Tribune calls it, the isolationist group led by Colonel McCormick of The Chicago Tribune, is in trouble politically. It attempted to put over its own man as chairman of the Republican National Committee in St. Louis a few weeks ago, and got badly licked. Then it attempted to dictate the Republican candidate for Mayor of Chicago for the election next April. But this was too much for the rank-and-file Republicans of Illinois, who don't always care to be tarred with the Colonel's brush. They repudiated the Colonel's man and announced their intention of putting their own candidate into the field against him, whereupon the isolationists' selection had no choice but to withdraw. Here is an encouraging sign of vigor and independence among the Republicans in an important Midwestern area.

Mr. Flynn Should Withdraw

Edward J. Flynn has in the past shown himself a loyal friend of President Roosevelt. He can now demonstrate that friendship once more by withdrawing his name from consideration as special ambassador to Australia. The hullabaloo that has been raised about him has destroyed any possible usefulness he might have in that post; the limelight that has beaten upon him has shown that this machine politician from the Bronx has not the character, personality, education or experience to make him of ambassadorial quality. If he wants to serve his country, and we assume he does, he can at the moment do this best of all by going home and staying there.

The Joads Are Not Wanted

The Labor Management Committee of the War Manpower Commission is considering a proposal advanced by the Florida growers to import workers from the Bahamas to harvest fruit and vegetable crops. Florida's large commercial farmers claim they need 15,000 workers, whereas the United States Employment Services estimates the actual need at 6,000. Meanwhile the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union, whose headquarters are in Memphis, Tennessee, has offered to supply 2,000 workers immediately for transportation to Florida under the terms of the Farm Security Administration program for supplying farm labor to critical labor-shortage areas.

So far all but a few of the growers have refused to accept the Farm Security Administration contract, which contains provisions for a minimum wage and recognizes the right of farm workers to join unions. Instead, they demand that workers be brought in from the West Indies. The United States Employment Services, which is responsible for recruiting labor for the Farm Security Administration, is caught between two fires. The upper South's plantation owners bring pressure to prevent farm labor from being moved, though they have no work to offer. The Florida growers do not want union members, and also prefer Negro to white workers, because they feel that Negroes may be more easily exploited. The American Farm Bureau Federation, representing the commercial farmers in Florida as in other states, is using its influence to sabotage the Farm Security Administration program for supplying farm-labor needs.

In addition to the workers already enlisted by the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union, this organization claims that it can enlist thousands of other underemployed farm laborers from the cotton plantations of the mid-South who are available for transportation under the terms of the Farm Security Administration contract. Before any workers are imported from the Bahamas or any more are brought from Mexico, the government should certainly utilize this manpower already available on Southern plantations.

Anti-Negro Discrimination

When Chairman McNutt of the War Manpower Commission on January 11 canceled the hearings scheduled by the Fair Employment Practices Committee to investigate discrimination against Negroes in the railroad industry, he struck at the heart of a necessary and highly important effort to solve one of the most serious problems threatening the nation's war effort. His ruling, issued without the approval of the majority of the committee, not only affects the war production program and national morale but it will have repercussions upon the people of the colored races among our allies who have looked to us to smash the totalitarian concept of race superiority and to establish the principle of race equality in the post-war world.

The canceled hearings involved the grievances of 2,400 Negro locomotive firemen (the most highly paid group of Negro workers in the United States) who are to be forced out of their jobs by an agreement signed in 1941 by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen and the Southeastern Carrier's Conference Committee. This agreement makes it impossible for a Negro to operate a Diesel engine, which the Interstate Commerce Commission has decreed must replace steam engines by July 1. Excluded from membership in the white Brotherhoods, the Negro firemen, with the aid of A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, established a Provisional Committee and succeeded in organizing 1,200 of the 2,400 Negro firemen. The Provisional Commit-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tee carried the case to the Fair Employment Practices Committee on the ground that railroads are a defense industry. An investigation was ordered and public hearings set for January 25-27.

A Job for FDR

If Mr. McNutt's act sheds light on those forces which are responsible for the sabotage of the FEPC it will have served a useful purpose. Only recently Mr. McNutt publicly declared: "We cannot contribute our full strength to the war effort . . . if barriers are maintained against any minority group. Every American must be permitted to play his part in the monumental task which faces us. . . . The War Manpower Commission intends to see that this is done." What was the pressure which forced him to reverse his position? We hope that President Roosevelt will intervene. He should order the FEPC to proceed with the investigation of the Negro firemen's case and restore the committee to its original status as an independent agency responsible only to the President.

The whole question of the status of Negro workers within trade unions must also be given serious consideration. During the past decade their position has greatly improved and much of the credit for this must go to the CIO. From its inception the AFL has likewise had a "policy" of no discrimination, but many of the national unions have pursued discriminatory practices. The trend is to cope with the problem by legislative enactment—New York, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin having led the way.

Was It Bureaucracy?

We have read with interest and sympathy the advertisements of the railroads telling us what a good job they are doing under great difficulties, and asking us to be patient with insufficient service in view of the needs of the armed forces. But wasn't it the railroads who opposed, and for many months postponed, the construction of oil pipelines to the Eastern seaboard, on the ground that they were equipped to carry all the oil that might be needed?

We recall this incident, not to be unpleasant, but merely to remind those who are freezing or have to give up the use of their cars that they are wrong if they blame governmental bureaucracy for all their inconveniences. From the day we began to rearm, those public servants who tried to enlarge our supplies of basic materials and the facilities for transporting and distributing them had to struggle against a powerful array of private interests which feared an economy of abundance and had long based their search for profits on a limitation of supply. We have no doubt that the railroads are now doing the best they can with the equipment at their disposal. But they cannot escape part of the responsibility for the fact that it is not enough.

Washington Dispatch

From a United Press dispatch: "Senator Nye told the Senate today that persons recently indicted for sedition by a District of Columbia grand jury are no more guilty of conspiracy than I am. . . ."

The North African Mess

JUDGED BY THE FINAL TEST, American policy in North Africa has proved bankrupt. That test is the hard and pragmatic one. It simply has not worked.

From the beginning The New Republic has said that you can't build a structure of order in North Africa by using only the mud and rubble of the Vichy collaborationists. That is now proving true with a vengeance. So far from beginning unity and order in North Africa, the policy followed by General Eisenhower and backed up by our minister, Robert Murphy, has brought disorder, conspiracy, arrests, civil conflict, intrigue, incessant behind-the-lines worry for the American military commanders. The fruits of "realism" have proved bitter to the taste and without nourishment to the body politic.

Is this so surprising? The conservative newspapers have set it all down to the orneriness of French politics. "The North African muddle" is the way they phrased it: and it is all treated as if foreigners move in some mysterious way their muddles to create. The bland assumption is, of course, that we have had nothing to do with the muddle. But what could we have expected except muddle when we appointed Darlan head of the region which we had come to wrest from him? What could we have expected except muddle when miraculously given a second chance by the death of Darlan, we muffed it and created a council of Vichy men—Boisson, Noguès, Chatel—to assist the reactionary, although patriotic, General Giraud?

Is American policy learning from these blunders? There are no signs yet that it is. In fact, we are recalling to North Africa from Argentina a former French colonial governor, Marcel Peyrouton, who can only increase the muddle. Peyrouton showed himself in his former administration of North Africa as a Martin Dies with a policeman's club. His specialty was repressive measures, his philosophy Red-baiting, his pride toughness. Whoever thought of calling him back was a fool or worse. Such action shows a total blindness to the simplest principles of political psychology, and misunderstands completely the roots of popular feeling in North Africa.

If, as Drew Middleton of The New York Times has suggested, you go among the workers in North Africa, not among the loungers in the expensive bars, you find readily enough what the people feel. They hate the Vichy men, both present and past. They distrust civilian

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rule by the old-school, reactionary generals. They despise the ragtail monarchists who have come to North Africa with their precious Count of Paris. Ninety percent of them, says Harold Macmillan, the new British minister, are for the republic. Of course they are restless. They are restless because the new purchasing power of the American soldiers is draining their small stock of civilian supplies and sending prices up. They are restless because the Vichy anti-Jewish laws have not been repealed and because the Nazi stain thus remains on North Africa. They are restless because democrats have been kept inside the prisons and concentration camps and Vichy men and fascists outside. They are restless because the reforms which the Giraud administration promised are still proceeding (to quote Drew Middleton again) "with majestic deliberation."

The apologia for all this is, of course, the now familiar State Department doctrine of non-intervention. The department recently addressed a little red booklet to the American people on the merits of American foreign policy in the last decade. Someone should now address a similar booklet to the State Department on the demerits of neutrality in a war that is supposed to be a struggle between democracy and fascism. American officials feel that they must remain neutral as between the Vichy men and the democrats in North Africa. It is as if a doctor were to remain neutral in the struggle between smallpox and his patient. You can be neutral only where you don't care about the result, or where the natural forces will work themselves out satisfactorily without your intervention. But in this case the civilian offices have been in the hands of Vichy men, and the bureaucracy, along with elements in the officer caste, hates the democratic republic. Our policy of keeping our hands off means that they keep their hands in.

Let us say quite candidly that the American officials have gone about the whole affair like the veriest tyros. General Eisenhower is bewildered by the intangibles of a political situation, and it was a mistake to expect him to add the burden of a proconsul to his military duties. As for our diplomatic officials, it is time that they stopped using the military necessities of Eisenhower as a screen for their own ineptness. If pursued farther their policy must lead to the diminution of American prestige, to an unnecessary rift with England (despite the polite statement by Minister of Information Brendan Bracken that the British accept General Eisenhower as their deputy); and to the involvement of America in the jungle of European politics and civil wars. American forces did not go into North Africa to become the last bulwark of European reaction.

The outlines of a workable North African policy are not tortuous or complex. First, recall Robert Murphy and replace him by someone who understands the diplomacy of a people's war. Second, put the fascists into jail and take the democrats out, and abolish the anti-Jewish laws. Third, send experienced economic administrators to set up an efficient system of rationing and price control. Fourth, transform the coming meeting of de Gaulle and Giraud into a meeting between French republicans of all shades of opinion, along with British and American representatives. Fifth, create out of such a conference a provisional French government under United Nations trusteeship which will lead the nation toward a plebiscite. Sixth, don't fragmentize France. The new government should be not only one for North Africa but also for West Africa, Syria, Martinique and every spot of French soil that is wrested from the Nazis. A liberated and unified France can then take its place among the United Nations.

This is as simple as democracy, as realistic as ordinary human nature in politics. It is an effort to resolve a problem not with the fantasies of diplomatic scheming but with the tested materials of democratic experience. And that is ultimately the tough-minded policy as well as the most honest and moral.

War Thoughts on Labor

A TIME OF WAR is probably not a good time for fundamental thinking on any deep social question, including that of labor. You don't swap horses while crossing a stream, said Lincoln: and, we might add, there is little likelihood that you swap ideologies either. Yet we cannot ignore the fact that the labor movement in America is in flux now as it has not been for a decade, when the movement for industrial unionism first began stirring. But the difference is that a decade ago, and especially in 1935 and 1936, there was a sense of positive direction in the air: whereas today that sense is lacking. The need to formulate that direction is one of the great needs of our day—both for labor and for the country as a whole.

The anti-labor forces are again forming their phalanxes for action. The election of a Seventy-eighth Congress even more reactionary than the Seventy-seventh has heartened the labor-baiters in Congress and out, and the Pappy O'Daniel-Westbrook Pegler axis may be expected to take on a new firmness. The drive against the so-called "forty-hour week" is less important in the battle of production than it is in the battle of opinion. The mail which congressmen are receiving from their rural constituents, with the repeated comment that "our boys on the front are not working a forty-hour week," is both a commentary on the failure of press and radio to make the real issue clear, and an omen of the dark energies which are forming against labor in the middle-class mind and which can be exploited by the unscrupulous.

Within the labor movement there are two viewpoints which are battling it out under the surface. One is the view that labor must not allow the war to be used as an excuse for the destruction of its social gains

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the reactionaries in the administration and in industry. The other is the view that labor must subordinate everything else to the struggle for mere survival which the war represents. President Murray's position in the CIO is that of a middle-of-the-roader who tries to bring the two positions together. The danger of this is that you try to travel both roads together, and you cannot do this and remain one traveler.

But this does not end the matter. The struggle of labor for a place in modern industrial society is not a static thing. The plane on which this struggle is waged, the form that it takes, depend entirely on what is happening in the country and the world at the time, and on the inner needs of a developing labor movement. Up to now labor's struggle has been for legal status, for economic power, for wages and hours and social legislation, for equality of bargaining position with the corporate employers.

But the targets at which the labor movement aims must now be entirely different. First, there is labor's stake in democratic survival itself. Second, labor today has the highest real wages, the greatest extent of employment and the best working conditions it has had in its history. It must therefore turn its energies away from its immediate interests to the points at which its long-run interests meet the long-run interests of the country. The demand of the CIO for more genuine war planning in the WPB is part of that. The recent report of the Fleming Committee to Manpower Administrator Paul McNutt is an even better instance. Here a group of managerial representatives and a group of labor leaders got together and made the best and most concrete suggestions for meeting the manpower shortage and resolving the tug-of-war among various agencies that have yet been made. Third, labor must continue to demand a place in the WPB and the other councils of the war economy. But labor must demand this insistently, not as a matter of group right but as a matter of national interest. It is a question whether the experience and skills that the labor leaders and the labor technicians have built up will be placed at the disposal of the nation in the most strategic possible areas. In so far as the structure of business power prevents labor from using this experience (as has been true so far), labor must use its own power both economically and politically to counteract it. But all the time labor must remember and make clear to the country that it is using its power in order to get a chance to serve a people's war and a people's peace —and not for its separate group interests.

So much for the war itself. Beyond the war there stretch the horizons of a post-war world with which labor must concern itself here and now. It is time for the labor movement to get a greater degree of economic sophistication than it has had. The tactic of relying only on wage struggles in order to effect a redistribution of national income and power is no longer the best tactic. If labor is today relatively well situated, it is because of the role of the government in its taxing capacity and its control over spending and investment. We must remember that future employment and future freedom will depend on the transfer of the same techniques from a wartime to a peacetime economy. This means that a new and important phase of political activity is opening up for labor, in which it must act as solidly as possible under the best available political leadership to achieve this sort of economy. The story of the recent congressional elections is the story of labor's failure to see the pressing need for such action.

One final word. This does not in any sense mean the abandonment of the militancy which has in the past five or six years allowed the CIO to revitalize the whole American labor movement. It means rather the rechanneling of that militancy so that it will be directed at the strategic points today, which are not the strategic points of yesterday. It means a labor philosophy which no longer stresses only immediate group gains or material gains, but which stresses instead what labor can contribute by its experience and its passion to the national interest. And not only the national: American labor will never be free from want or from fear unless it acts with the labor movements of the other United Nations, particularly Britain, Russia and the Latin American countries. Only such an international outlook and only such international ties will help blast away the obstructions in the path of democracy, for the common enemy that both labor and democracy must fight is a narrow corporate outlook operating within a narrow and blind nationalism.

What is needed today from labor leaders is a clear, ringing, dramatic declaration of such principles as these, arresting enough so that, despite the O'Daniels and Peglers, it will catch the imagination of the common man everywhere.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Managing Editor: THOMAS SANCTON

Literary Editor: ALFRED KAZIN

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: BYRON DEXTER, ELIZABETH HULING

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, JULIAN HUXLEY, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russian Offensive—German Crisis

THE SOVIET OFFENSIVE in southeastern Russia has furnished the outstanding contribution to United Nations strategy in the winter of 1942-43. It has brought about the severest crisis in the German conduct of war so far, and it is giving new perspectives to Allied strategy for 1943. This fighting has been much more intensive than were the summer operations. It is the great test of the striking power and strategy of both armies, of their respective strength and the quality of their conduct of war.

This offensive has revealed the material might of the Red Army. The Russian reserves in manpower and arms were of all the more consequence, inasmuch as they were used against a greatly exhausted enemy. They were hurled into the battle at precisely that moment at which they could attain the greatest strategic results. In the late fall the German army had been weakened first by the futile siege of Stalingrad and the unsuccessful assault on the Caucasian mountain range; second, by the overextension of its front lines. During this period the Red Army High Command shifted the bulk of the Russian forces from the central front and concentrated them on the southern front, bringing forward carefully accumulated reserves. At that moment—chosen by the Russian High Command—the German army lost its earlier material superiority. Since the beginning of the offensive the Red Army has had a definite preponderance in infantry and artillery, and probably in tanks as well. The real relationship of the forces on the Russian front has now become apparent.

Up to now it has been difficult to deduce the actual relation of these forces on the basis of the effective troops at the front, simply because the use of reserves differed greatly. The German High Command used its reserves much more ruthlessly, and from the start of the campaign. As a result it was repeatedly conjectured during the German-Russian seesaw that the Nazis might be as much as three times as strong as the Red Army in offensive weapons, in tanks and aviation. But this was a mere optical illusion, an instantaneous photograph, so to speak, of the respective balance of forces at the front alone, where the Germans used up strong reserves while the Russians were husbanding theirs. The Russian war planning, in contrast to the German, aimed at being stronger than the enemy at the end of the campaign. Today there can be no question that the Red Army possessed and still possesses reserves for the offensive.

The Red Army has also proved its ability to wage major offensive operations. The greatest accomplishment in modern warfare is the large-scale maneuver. It is based on coördination and simultaneous operation of large units, of entire armies. It must be conducted in vast spaces and as a war of movement. And it is directed at the encirclement and annihilation of strong enemy forces. Operations are still in progress, but all these elements have already been combined by the Red Army in this offensive as a method of the conduct of war. Qualitatively, the present offensive is at a higher level than the offensive in the winter of 1941-42 before Moscow. At that time the heavy German losses were a result of the unexpected retreat. But this time the Red Army is deliberately striving to cut off the retreat of the Nazis. The Russian blows are no isolated individual thrusts, but rather components of one single offensive operation, aimed at one object and one goal. The goal is the complete destruction of the German armies in the south; the object is the geographic center of gravity of the German defenses around Rostov, with their lines of communication that are holding the German southern front together. The successive Russian attacks, first around Stalingrad, then from the Middle Don and along the Lower Don and in the northern Caucasus, are far-sighted operations in this action.

The method of Russian strategy in this super-battle consists of paralyzing the German armies and controlling the battlefield so that the enemy has to fight under the most unfavorable conditions. This is the situation in the second half of January: the German army before Stalingrad completely trapped and eliminated from the synchronized ensemble of the German forces in southeastern Russia. The German army in the Caucasus is threatened and almost surrounded, and it is able to communicate with the rest of the German front only through the narrow bottleneck around Rostov. The German troops around the mouth of the Don, which are defending the approaches to Rostov, are pressed with their backs to the coast of the Sea of Azov, packed into a narrow area where any kind of maneuvering and deployment of forces is very difficult. Of all German armies in southeastern Russia, this group alone has relative freedom of action and the possibility of broader and more direct communication with the German rear in the Ukraine. This group is most active in its defense, but it too is in peril of being enveloped by the Red Army from the southeast.

The course of the action shows a certain resemblance to the Battle of Flanders. This time the Red Army holds the initiative in leading the great movement of encirclement and annihilation, and the German army might well be maneuvered into a situation as critical as that of the Franco-British-Belgian armies in May, 1940. The encirclement of the German armies in southeastern Russia is proceeding in two areas: it is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

completed as far as the German armies around Stalingrad are concerned, and is under way against the Nazis in the Caucasus. The mouth of the Don might assume the role the mouth of the Somme played in 1940, and Rostov that of Abbéville—where in May, 1940, the German army reached the Channel ports—in a Russian break-through to the coast. Rostov is nearest to the coast and therefore the spot upon which the Russian blows are converging from the north and from the east. To be sure, this comparison to the Battle of Flanders is drawn here merely as graphic illustration. The battle in southeastern Russia is proceeding over far greater spaces and at slower speed, and the defender is tenacious in his resistance and has considerable reserves. But the designs of the two battles show great similarity.

The far-sightedness and endurance of Russian strategic planning has again been proved. There can be no doubt that the Russian counter-offensive was decided upon at least as far back as September, 1942, at the time when the Red Army was defending Stalingrad with rather limited forces. The battle of Stalingrad was by no means a desperate last-minute stand on the part of the Russians. It was a cunning delaying action designed to give the Red Army time to shift to the offensive; it was a strategic screen behind which the forces were being deployed for the counter-offensive. The Russian reserves were not frittered away in defensive actions but conserved for the great offensive. During the most critical phase of the war the Russians defended themselves by husbanding their forces in such a way that the subsequent attack was made possible. The strategic goals of the defensive operations were then attained by the counter-offensive. It took nerves of steel and the minutest calculations on the part of the Red Army High Command to resist the temptation to use its reserves too soon, and to choose the most expedient moment for the shift from the defensive to the offensive.

The German crisis in the Russian war has had two aspects. It was, first, a crisis of material. The Nazis had fewer offensive weapons on the Russian front in 1942 than in 1941. In the German offensive last summer and later during the siege of Stalingrad and the assault against the Caucasian mountain range, the offensive weapons of the Nazis were insufficient in quantity to break the system of Soviet defense. It is possible that German arms production fell off in 1942. It is likely that German arms reserves were used up and that the current production could not safeguard replacements on the previous scale. But it is undeniable that the Russian-German balance of arms did not tally with the German superiority in raw materials—in coal, iron ore, steel and aluminum. The conveyor belt from the production centers to the tremendously faraway fronts functioned poorly and was broken in various places. Thus the German army has had to pay dearly for its strategy of ruthless territorial conquest by a crisis in supply and a diminishing of its offensive power. In the decisive moment at the decisive front the strength of Russian arms was at least equal to, and probably greater than, that of the Germans. So we have a situation in which the Soviet Union is stronger in military than in industrial respects, while the exact reverse is true for Germany.

Even more noteworthy and more dangerous for the Third Reich is the strategic crisis of the German army, the crisis of military planning. The German summer offensive was brilliantly executed in an operational sense, but in the long run its foundation was unstable and it was reckless and without perspective. The three-months'-long assault on Stalingrad was utterly senseless; a frontal attack on a fortified position is one of the costliest undertakings. The Russian counter-offensive came as a complete surprise to the German High Command. Since the end of November the German strategy in southeastern Russia has consisted of passive defense, with hardly any counter-maneuver. The Red Army, on the other hand, shifted from defense to a war of movement. The situation as it is now, with the German front broken and the coöperation among the various sectors of the front made impossible, with the German armies surrounded or in peril of being surrounded, is humiliating for the German High Command. A situation like this is utterly unprecedented for the Germans; it never arose in World War I, nor has the German army had to face anything remotely similar since the Napoleonic Wars. The events on the Russian front are a tangible contradiction of Hitler's concept of the defense of the "fortress of Europe." When the German offensive in Russia had fizzled out, the next phase was not stabilization of the German front at the peak of its successes, but the crumbling of that front and the Russian shift to a war of movement.

The stakes in the great battle in southeastern Russia are no more and no less than the very existence of the German army as an able-bodied force. If it loses this battle, then—this is the least one can say—the German army is broken as an offensive force. And then the Russian front will sooner or later become a wide-open gateway to the fortress of Europe. The final phase of the battle is going to be the most difficult for both armies. For the Red Army it is the question of supply that will be the most critical problem, especially coal supplies for the railways at the front; another problem will be the maintenance of the Red Army's complement in tanks. The Nazis, on the other hand, need for defense fresh reserves from the west, a force which would have the task of hammering the flank of the Red Army between the Donets and the Don. But the question is whether the German army can throw such a relief force into southeastern Russia quickly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enough and whether it has the necessary striking power to do it.

It is now possible to make two major positive entries in the strategic balance sheet of the United Nations, namely the Russian reserves and the offensive capacity of the Red Army. One might therefore conclude that the coalition strategy of the Allies for 1943 will assume the character of a combined Soviet-Anglo-American offensive. The Red Army is actually waging this winter offensive single-handed, relieved only at the periphery, in North Africa, and only to a small degree. In 1942 the Red Army has fulfilled, and more than fulfilled, its obligations as an ally. One can already perceive the tremendous consequences the Russian offensive might have had if there had been simultaneously, and coördinated with it, an Allied offensive on the European continent. And one can foresee the results such a combined offensive must have in 1943. The task of Allied strategy in Europe is not relief for Russia but the crushing of the German army's defensive strength. The prime requisite for this is that the German army should not have the chance to rally after the blows it has now suffered in southeastern Russia. It must not be given the time and the opportunity to regroup its forces as in the spring and early summer of 1942.

The most pressing obligation of Allied strategy is that of utilizing to the hilt the months between now and the beginning of June, in order to concentrate all available means in time to intensify the war in all its forms and to wear down the enemy in the transition period before the great offensive. MAX WERNER

Can We Afford the War?

WHAT DOES IT MEAN when the President forecasts an expenditure of a hundred billion dollars on war in the fiscal year 1944, and a national debt of somewhere near two hundred billions at the end of it? These figures are so huge that they cannot be understood in terms of the dollars we as individuals spend or the amounts we owe. As far as any concrete impression they may convey to us is concerned, he might as well have said that the government is going to spend a lot of money and will have a bigger debt than anybody ever heard of. Instead of the numerical symbols consisting of figures and zeroes, he might just as well have said that the bill will be n dollars and the debt x dollars.

Nevertheless, this symbolic language may be interpreted so that it does have a bearing on questions that are of immense interest to us. What shall we have to sacrifice for the war economy? Is the cost of living going up? Are we going to be impoverished by that big debt? Is there any chance of the government itself going bankrupt, so that our savings stamps and bonds will be worthless?

Before we get to these larger questions, we can learn something interesting about the pattern of the war activity itself.

How the War Effort Is Changing. – First of all, we must realize that the budget of war expenditures really means how the country's resources of material, manpower and mechanical energy are committed. If we had before us a budget in terms, not of dollars, but of war goods and services, as somebody must have had before the money totals were computed, we should understand the budget as a production program. The President cannot give us that, but his figures do reveal some relevant facts.

In March, 1942, the Department of Commerce estimated that in the present fiscal year, ending June 30 next, our net expenditure on war would be $53,000,000,000. The budget message now estimates it as $77,000,000,000. Since there has been no marked rise in prices in the interim, that means that we have stepped up our production much more rapidly than had been anticipated, and that there has been a larger expansion of the armed forces.

The President says that the 1943 budget dealt with transforming a peace economy into a war economy, while the new one "presents the maximum program for waging war." Concrete evidence of that can be found in the figures. Between the present fiscal year and the next, the amount to be spent for munitions rises from $43,000,000,000 to $66,000,000,000, while the amount for industrial construction falls from six billions to a paltry two billions. That means that within a few months our plant will be nearly built, and we shall be buying all the war goods it can ever turn out. The pay and other expenses of the armed forces will rise from fifteen to twenty-one billions, while "other construction"—presumably quarters for them, transportation facilities and the like, will require an outlay smaller by three billions. By the end of 1943, in other words, there will be little possibility of further stepping up our war effort, and apparently few plans are being laid to do so. That confirms impressions from other sources as to when the supreme effort is expected to be made.

The Possibility of Economies. – With all the congressional chatter about the overgrown bureaucracy in Washington and the need of cutting civilian expenses to the bone, some of us may have concluded that there is a possibility of saving which would make a real dif-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ference in our taxes or the government deficit. Yet the cold figures make it plain that any such hope is nonsense.

War expenses make up about one hundred billions out of a budget of about one hundred and nine billions. We could therefore save something less than nine percent by abolishing *all* non-war expenses. This would include failing to pay the three billions' interest which will be due on the public debt. But if we really want to keep the government going, including Congress, the Supreme Court, the President and his executive offices, and pay our obligations under social security, those to veterans, to the retired, etc., there is precious little left to cut. Congress could get out $888,319,000 by abolishing all aids to agriculture, and another $354,000,000 by refusing all money for general public works. Watch Congress rush to do it! Of course that would injure the war effort too, in many respects. If the economizers turn up with a saving of as much as one percent as a result of all their hullabaloo, they will have produced a miracle.

The President tactfully invites them to cut, but he points out that there are fewer than 850,000 civilian employees, including the postmen, in the so-called "non-war" services, and that non-war expenditures have already been reduced by more than a third since 1939.

Economy may be a good game for sniping congressmen, but the citizens can expect no relief from it. Indeed, they might be seriously injured if essential services were discontinued.

How Much Will Be Left for Civilians? – Mr. Roosevelt estimates that there will be left, after supplying the war needs, goods and services enough to make up an average of $500 worth to each of the rest of us. That sounds pretty small, yet it is only one-quarter less than in the record year for civilian spending—1941. If one thinks of all the things we can't buy any more, it looks as if we should be comfortably supplied with the essentials, provided, as the President says, production is concentrated on them and the distribution is fair.

The details of the calculations are not presented, but if the budget-makers figured that after deducting the numbers in the armed forces there will be 125,000,000 civilians left, the gross value of products and services for civilian use would be $62,500,000,000. Civilians are going to have a lot more money than that which they could spend, if there were anything to spend it for. Of course, they might spend the surplus, if they tried hard enough, but they would not get any more goods for it. The goods there are would merely cost more. The amount which they will be able to spend at existing prices, however, is only slightly less than the total national income before the war started. It doesn't sound like a great hardship.

What About Those High Taxes? – Nearly everyone is worrying about how he is going to pay his income tax, and a great many people are going to have to pay who never paid before. But let us for a moment adopt a broader view of the problem.

The budget calculates that under the present tax laws the government will collect nearly $35,500,000,000 in the fiscal year 1944. That is less than one-third of the amount which the government plans to spend. Where is the rest of the money to come from?

The President recommends that the government gain $16,000,000,000 more through additional taxes or "savings." News commentators and congressmen have assumed that this "savings" refers to compulsory savings levied on the citizens. I do not interpret it that way; apparently it means any savings made by Congress in governmental expenditure (which necessarily will be small). It seems to me that the President would be reckless indeed if he did not favor raising at least that $16,000,000,000 by extra taxation. The reason will appear in a moment.

If the $16,000,000,000 is added to the $35,500,000,000, we have a current revenue of $51,500,000,000 to the government, less than one-half of its total expenditures. The government then still has to get more than $57,000,000,000 in some other way. What way?

Borrowing, of course. And much of this borrowing must be from us, the citizens and taxpayers. The great bond drive, just ended, pleased everybody concerned by raising $12,000,000,000 in 1942. Can the government raise five times that amount in one year, or anywhere near it, by any drive? Perhaps, but it looks dubious, especially after taxes have been jacked up twice—once for 1943, again for 1944. Here is where compulsory savings must come in. Many people will be more ready to let the government take their money if they get in return a claim on future purchasing power.

But can the government take all this money from us, by way of taxes and loans, and still leave us enough with which to buy the civilian goods and services available? Of course it can. We don't even need figures to prove it. Somebody gets paid the full value of everything that is produced. Workers, management, corporations, farmers—all together are receiving a total of wages and profits which just equals the sales value of all the goods and services turned out in the country. They would need all they receive in order to buy the product—*if they bought it all*. But the government is going to buy a lot of it—more than half, in fact. Therefore, if they turn over to the government all the money it needs to buy its share, they necessarily have just enough left to buy the rest. (All this, of course, assumes that prices don't change during the period.)

We may make an exceedingly rough calculation to check the point. Government is to spend $109,000,-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southern State Normal School Library

000,000. We are to spend $62,500,000,000. That adds up to gross national product of $171,500,000,000. Is the national money income going to be big enough to finance that expenditure, if out of that income the government collects the $109,000,000,000 which it needs?

The gross national product is always larger than the "national income," because of the way of figuring the latter, which is on a "net" basis. For the present fiscal year, according to the Department of Commerce forecast previously cited, the gross national product was estimated at $132,000,000,000. As a matter of fact it will be larger than that, because production has increased faster than was expected. This product corresponds to a "national income" of perhaps $115,000,000,000. A gross product of $171,000,000,000, corresponding to a national income of $140,000,000,000, is not inconceivable for the next fiscal year. If we don't achieve it, the reason will be that we don't produce enough, rather than any lack of money to buy what we produce.

In all this discussion of dollars, we must keep our eye on the ball—actual goods and services. If we do this, we shall remember that, no matter how much money the government leaves in our hands, there won't be more than a certain amount of goods and services for us to buy. In reality, then, the burden of taxes is fictitious. We shall not be one egg or one gallon of gasoline worse off if the government takes from us all it spends.

Here there is an important qualification. We shall not be worse off as a nation, but *you* and *I* may be worse off if the taxes are not levied according to ability to pay. A general sales tax, or a general payroll levy, or a gross income tax (like the present Victory tax) is not graduated according to the size of the income, and so hits the poor harder than the rich. The higher taxes become, the more likely Congress is to put an unfair burden on the lower incomes, and the more important it becomes to see that Congress doesn't.

Is Inflation Likely? – So far, we have been assuming that prices are not going to get out of hand. If they do, then the people with fixed incomes will suffer, and the people whose incomes come from profits or speculation will benefit—temporarily.

To see whether inflation is likely, we have only to carry the reasoning in the previous section a step further. Suppose the government does not get all the money it needs from taxation and from our loans to it —forced or otherwise. Where will the rest come from? It will come from the banks. This will be new money, that neither the government, nor you and I, nor even the banks, had before. The transaction is simple. The government prints a note or a bond. The bank "buys" the note or the bond by opening a deposit for the government. This deposit consists of brand-new purchasing power, which nobody ever put into the bank. Of course, the bank may pay for the bond by a check or in some other way, but the upshot is the same.

As a result we shall have more than enough money with which to buy the goods for sale. This money will remain in the hands of civilian purchasers. The government will have just enough for its needs, but since it will have obtained only part from us, and part from the banks, it will leave us with more than enough to buy our share. If we put that surplus under the mattress, no immediate harm is done. But if we go out and buy things with it, we put a strain on rationing and price control, we favor black markets, and if we persist, we cause inflation.

In the fiscal year 1941 the government borrowed $3,300,000,000 from commercial banks. In 1942 it borrowed from them $6,100,000,000. It is estimated that in 1943 it will have borrowed from them $29,100,000,000, or three-fifths of all its borrowings. This is two and one-half times as much as it obtained from sale of war savings bonds.

Watch this leak in the dyke! It has not already caused appreciable inflation because production has increased so rapidly, and because we have had stocks of goods that had accumulated from previous years. In other words, there have been enough goods to buy so that an increase in our money supply did not far outrun them. But by 1944 we shall be at maximum production. The old stocks of consumers' goods will not hold out forever. Suppose in that year, government borrowing from the banks creates $50,000,000,000 of extra money, and an equivalent amount is left in our hands. Will the cost of living rise? It will, unless we use the dollar bills we cannot spend at present prices to stuff into our window cracks, light our fires and paper our walls.

The only way to avoid this danger is to force Congress to take the required money from us by taxes and compulsory loans, so that the government will not have to borrow much from the banks, or to buy bonds with the surplus, in so far as Congress does not act in this way.

This means that we should be wise to turn over to the government, in taxes and bond buying, not merely the $35,500,000,000 required by the present tax law plus the $12,000,000,000 we paid for bonds this year, and not merely the $16,000,000,000 more that the President now asks Congress to levy, but also $46,000,000,000 in addition to make up that total of $109,000,000,000.

How About That $200,000,000,000 Debt? – Before we begin to consider the size of the national debt which will result from the war, let us clear our minds a little as to what sort of thing the debt is. First of all, it is distinctly not a way of getting rid of any of the real cost of the war by passing it on to future generations. We

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cannot borrow from those who are to be living ten or twenty years hence the gas and oil consumed by our flying fortresses, or the tanks or the shells or the powder. There will, of course, be that much less oil and iron and chemicals in the ground, but we have to produce and fabricate it all, sacrificing now from civilian consumption everything the armed forces need to carry on the war.

Next, we should remember that as far as the money itself is concerned, it can keep on circulating both when it is borrowed and when it is repaid. In other words, the government spends now every cent we lend it, paying it to us. And when it begins to pay interest on the money, or to repay the borrowings, we must think of it as paying back to someone in the country—that is, to the bondholders—the money that it receives for this purpose from taxpayers. If the bondholders and the taxpayers happen to be the same people, as in many cases they are, paying the debt will not be a burden in the sense that paying a mortgage to a bank is a burden to the individual; it will simply be transferring money from one hand to the other.

Thus, abstractly, there is absolutely no possibility of the government's becoming bankrupt, and absolutely no limit to the possible size of the debt, *provided* taxation is adjusted approximately to the receipts of taxpayers from their ownership of government bonds. If I pay $25 in taxes for interest and amortization on the government debt, and in the same year receive $25 because of the government bonds I hold, neither I nor anyone else nor the government is richer or poorer by the transaction.

Will Taxation Be Properly Adjusted? – There is a serious question, however, whether the same persons who pay the taxes will be those who receive interest and principal payments on the bonds. After the last war, most people of small income sold or cashed in their bonds, which were accumulated by those with large incomes. The situation was made worse by the fact that interest from the bonds was tax-exempt, so that they became attractive investments for those who otherwise would have had to pay big surtaxes. The new bonds, however, are not tax-exempt. This plugs a big hole. No matter how concentrated bond holdings may become, we can always adjust taxation to incomes.

It is also possible to bring about wide purchases of the bonds during the war; this is being done with a fair degree of success. Even so, those with small incomes are likely to get rid of their bonds afterwards if they suffer unemployment, or are impoverished by inflation.

What we should strive to do in order to avoid a debt burden, therefore, is not so much to try to keep the debt small as to adopt the policies necessary to avoid inflation and depression and, in our taxation system, stick as closely as possible to taxes graduated according to ability to pay. The big debt would be an incubus indeed if tax receipts came mainly from general sales or payroll taxes which bore most heavily on the poor while the bonds were held mainly by the rich, and if at the same time we had a large volume of unemployment.

Must We Be Poorer Later Because of Our Present War Cost? – We have seen that, in terms of money, this need not be so. How about the real goods and services? We have also seen that we are sacrificing *now* the real things needed to fight the war, and so shall not have to sacrifice them in the future. But there is more than this to be said. Our national product during the war has quickly risen to an enormous volume, which few suspected we were capable of turning out. It is so big, in fact, that we can devote to war more material than does the entire Axis, and still have enough left for civilians so that they can live better than they actually did only a few years ago. If we can, after the war, produce and distribute for peaceful uses an equal amount, we not only shall not be poorer, but shall be immensely richer than we ever have been. There is nothing about the mere existence of the debt, no matter how large it may be, to prevent us from achieving this result.

Management of the Debt Will Be Important. – How we manage the debt payments, however, may have an important effect on how fully we use the productive capacity which we are proving we have. This is a complicated subject in detail. But a few general principles may be briefly summarized. Repayments of debt to those with small incomes will be used mainly for the purchase of goods. Repayments to those with large incomes will be used, if at all, mainly for investments in new production. It is important that when we distribute tax receipts for repayments of debt, we are reasonably sure that the money will be used either for one purpose or the other. If people acquire extra purchasing power for consumption goods more rapidly than those goods become available for purchase, inflation is favored. If investors do not make new investments as rapidly as they receive their money from the government, depression will ensue.

There may be times when the debt ought to be decreased, and times when it ought to be increased. There may be times when the government ought to borrow less from the banks, and times when it ought to borrow more. The intention here is not to lay down a set of rules for future action in this matter. It is simply to point out that once we cease to regard the debt as an ogre, and repayment of it as a fetish, we can use governmental fiscal policy to aid the maximum production of the real goods which are of more importance to us than dollar signs and long strings of zeroes.

GEORGE SOULE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Four Years of Franco

WHEN, ON DECEMBER 5, Franco wired Hitler, "May your arms triumph in the glorious undertaking of freeing Europe from the Bolshevik terror," and three days later in a formal speech branded liberalism and democracy "an old prejudice" and hailed Mussolini and Germany as representing the new era with which he felt himself identified, there was a gasp of surprise and dismay from the press and people of the United Nations. When, about two weeks later, the Spanish Foreign Minister, General Count Gomez Jordana, announced the creation of an "Iberian bloc" to maintain the neutrality of Spain and Portugal, the event was greeted with a blank stare, few people in the democracies admitting that they knew whether it was good news or bad.

Did Franco's insulting slap at Great Britain and the United States mean that the situation in Spain had changed? Was it psychological preparation for overt war on the side of the Axis, as a new theatre of war opened in North Africa? But if so, why the Spanish-Portuguese declaration of neutrality?

There is no change in the realities on the Iberian Peninsula, save in one particular, but that a significant one and in process of development. Franco is exactly what he has been, his allegiance and his purpose precisely what they were when, with the aid of Mussolini and Hitler, he proclaimed the fascist rebellion in Spain in 1936. Portugal is what she has been since 1663, when King Charles II of England married Catherine of Braganza—the friend of Britain, whose men-of-war guarded her empire, the third largest of any European nation's. But the attitude of ten Latin American nations toward the Axis has changed. It is now one of avowed hostility. And that change affects the Iberian Peninsula profoundly.

Portugal is proud of her daughter-republic Brazil, proud of Brazilian vitality and progress. With Brazil at war with Germany, the fidelity of Portugal to the cause of the Allies becomes absolutely certain. The Spanish-Portuguese entente could have been formed only because England advised it, or at least acquiesced.

Nazi divisions are on the Pyrenees. In the past, the British have several times invaded Spain through Portugal. Has Portugal given Spain a pledge that there will be no British invasion through Portuguese territory this time, in return for Franco's word that there will be no march of German legions into Portugal from Spain —for whatever Franco's word is worth?

What is Franco's word worth? What is he trying to do? What *can* he do for Germany?

He said, in those days which must seem to some to belong almost to a past century, that his fascist rebellion was justified because it was the defender of "order," of "Christianity," of "Western civilization." The governments of Europe, the immense majority of the governments of America, decided to agree with him. The Non-Intervention Committee, without embarrassment and with seeming pleasure, permitted Mussolini to send help to Franco, permitted Hitler to train his experts and test his arms and the tactics of blitzkrieg on the body of liberal Spain because world-Toryism considered Mussolini, Hitler and their man Franco bastions of "Western order."

Hitler, Mussolini, Franco have not changed. It is the other parties to that bitter, that tragic, that still almost unimaginable deal who have, under the heel of a fascist boot which has reduced a continent to "order" —to slavery and death—experienced a certain alteration in their point of view.

The reality in Spain is that Spain's civil war has never ended. Spain cannot be neutral nor has she been so for a single day since this war began. Since July 18, 1936, the Axis has had political control of the islands of Mallorca and Ibiza and, since 1939, of the island of Minorca. Spain cannot be neutral because, shortly after the beginning of the Spanish civil war, Franco authorized the Germans to mount heavy guns on the mountains which form an arc from the northwest to the northeast of Gibraltar, guns which dominate Gibraltar, cross their fire with the batteries of Ceuta in Spanish Morocco and dominate the straits and the British batteries. She cannot be neutral because during the civil war Germany constructed numerous airfields both in the north and the south of Spain in anticipation of what was to come. And because Spain could not be neutral, Franco agreed, when the republicans were crushed, that the Gestapo should be installed at Madrid and should create and direct a network of groups recruited among falangist elements, a network which extends throughout the country and exercises the triple functions of espionage, intimidation and the carrying out of acts of terror. She is not neutral but a belligerent today, as is proved by the decree issued on December 30. In that decree the Blue Spanish Division, now fighting against Russia, is declared to be no longer a group of volunteers but an official army unit.

Spain is giving Germany and Italy all she produces and in doing so she has created within the country the deepest misery and most frightful poverty in Spanish history. Franco's "restored economy" has attained a volume of imports and exports equal to 59 percent of that of 1935, and that was a depression year.

Spanish agriculture is ruined. It is in ruins partly because it lacks fertilizers, of which Spain used to import millions of metric quintals each year, in particular superphosphates and nitrates. It is in ruins because all

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Spain is in ruins, depressed by a deep sense of sadness and rancor, a product of the absence of humanity, generosity and political vision on the part of those who won the civil war. Instead of seeking peace, that faction has continued the war. It has not made a single gesture of comprehension which might have initiated the reconciliation of factions. Thousands of men and women are still in the prisons and labor camps, suffering every sort of oppression, dying from starvation and from illnesses contracted in the course of degrading tasks.

There is not a traveler arriving in America from Spain who fails to make the same observations in respect to that country: that bands of beggars rove the countryside and the cities, in a striking state of physical misery, that there is an enormous contrast between the different social classes—ostentatious wealth and universal wretchedness—and that there is absolute demoralization in the administration.

The country is more divided than it was when the fighting of the civil war was in progress. Neither the Church, the army, the students nor the other social forces which backed Franco are of the same mind they were then. The Church is divided from top to bottom. The statement of the Bishop of Calahorra, condemning Nazi-fascism in flattest terms, far from representing a purely personal attitude, is the expression of an opinion which is widely shared. The Archbishop of Valladolid has seconded it. The Katholischen Volksblatt, issued in Berne, reports that the Valladolid newspaper, El Diario Regional, of April 14, 1942, published a speech by Archbishop Antonio García denouncing the sale of Rosenberg's book "The Myth of the Twentieth Century," and threatening to condemn the periodical Señales because of its "indecent material favoring the pagan orientation of youth." To my desk there come, through irreproachable channels, cries of anguish from priests who belong to religious orders and long for a movement of reconciliation. Nothing less like a religious attitude than the attitude of the regime now ruling Spain could be conceived.

The army is largely opposed to the Falange, which finds in the street and in the universities, among monarchists and republicans, elements which combat it by fire and sword. Last spring the Central University at Madrid was once again the scene of bloodshed when a battle occurred between armed student factions. It is said with bitter cynicism that only one man could unite Spain: Serrano Suñer. He could unite the country only in the sense that absolutely everybody hates him. There is behind him today the depleted Falange, but he is the scapegoat for Spanish society, the object of its fears and rancors. His recent dismissal was the result of a personal clash with General Varela, the former Minister of War, following the bombing of a monarchist meeting which Suñer had tried to suppress.

So what can Franco do for his Germans and his Italians? Would open war on the side of the Axis unify Spain? All the evidence indicates that it would tear her apart more violently.

Will Hitler enter Spain anyway? Predictions are dangerous, but I think it is improbable. For geographical, technical and temperamental reasons Spain is a difficult country for an army to enter. It is an even more difficult country for an army to get out of. Spain's mountains and plateaus cross from east to west. Her railway network is single-track almost everywhere and of small use for the rapid transportation of troops. Spain's roads, once magnificent, have been unrepaired since the civil war. These factors create difficult problems in logistics for an invading army. Add to them the belligerent temper of the Spanish people, the ill will with which, even in the army, they would for the most part greet the Nazis now, and their terrible poverty, and you have a situation that appears to be unpromising for German forces crossing Spain.

There are two harmful things of a military nature that Franco could still do to the United Nations. The first would be to give to the Germans full military use of the islands of Mallorca, Minorca and Ibiza. The second, and more serious one, would be to give Hitler the use of the magnificent naval base of Cartagena, near Oran and the Straits of Gibraltar.

The restless army of Spanish Morocco could, of course, make plenty of trouble. Whether it will do so depends, perhaps, chiefly on the speed with which the Allies liquidate their North African campaign. A protracted siege might touch off trouble there and alter the situation in Spain as well.

Franco has always wished the democracies ill and Franco has not changed. The one factor which can restrain him from doing such further damage as may lie in his power is the one which we have seen influencing Portugal—the political and diplomatic actions of the nations of Latin America. The attitude of the countries of Latin America is becoming more important every day in determining the international orientation of Spain. Every day, in her own misery, Spain feels a deeper interest in and affection for the peoples of her own language and culture across the sea. In the mind of Spain, the community of her destiny with that of Latin America is becoming more and more clear. I do not think there exists in Spain a single responsible man who dares to face a war with the countries in which Spain sees the future of her own culture.

In these momentous circumstances, will Latin America know how to act? The country which has acted with the greatest clearness in this respect has been Cuba. Will other Latin American nations follow her lead? What Brazil means to Portugal, the Spanish-speaking nations of America mean to Spain—the whole Spain. What they do may determine not only the further acts of Franco in this war, but the survival of the regime placed in Spain by Germany and Italy.

FERNANDO DE LOS RIOS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Future of Liberal Education

NEW PLAN SUSPENDS LIBERAL EDUCATION. Stimson and Knox Give Details of Draft of Colleges." That headline of The New York Times is perhaps too sweeping; and yet there can be no doubt that the lowering of the draft age to eighteen has involved the men's liberal colleges in a desperate crisis. The effect of that action is to claim, for the government, priority over the raw materials on which a college works. Just as steel, copper and nickel may not be manufactured into automobiles for general use, so young men who are physically and mentally fit for military service may not be manufactured into persons of liberal understanding. They must be made into soldiers.

Liberal teaching is, then, suspended in the men's colleges, except as it may be given to pupils under eighteen or to those who have been rejected for military service. But this action has a secondary effect. It means that the teachers, laboratories and other equipment of the colleges are available for the army and navy as they provide non-liberal training for their new recruits. And the essence of the "new plan" which implements the draft order is that the government will make a financial arrangement with selected colleges, paying them to provide technical instruction to specified soldiers and sailors. Wherever that bargain is made, the colleges, like the automobile plants, will have been "converted." What will become of the other colleges—those whose teachers and equipment the army and navy do not use—that is an, as yet, unanswered question whose heart-breaking urgency is suggested by the grim army announcement, "The procedure for the selection of the colleges to be used in the training programs will be announced shortly. Meanwhile, college officials or representatives will attain no advantage by attempting to present the merits of their particular institution to the joint committee."

As we attempt to interpret this bewildering situation, it should be noted that the plans thus far announced are not in final form. They give only a general program whose more specific applications are still under consideration by the army and navy, by the War Manpower Commission, by the Office of Education, by semi-official educational councils and by representatives of colleges and universities who have been called into conference. No one can hope, at this preliminary stage, to bring to a single focus all the problems which will arise as the situation develops. We can only single out a number of factors which affect either the winning of the war or the charting of the course of American liberal education for the future.

The action of the government in converting or suspending our liberal colleges is, to many Americans, deeply shocking. It has been said of those institutions, on high oratorical authority, that though they are small, "men love them." A business man may, with some equanimity, accept the converting of his plant, especially if a fair bargain is offered him. But to convert his college or, even worse, to leave it stranded without students, without student fees—that smacks of desecration. Can the decision of the army be justified?

To that question my own answer is an unequivocal affirmative. And that assertion holds no matter what may be the effect on the fortunes of the colleges. We are fighting a war for human freedom. If, then, young men are fit for fighting, if it is judged necessary that they be drafted for fighting, the only question worth considering is how to get them trained, as quickly and effectively as possible, to take their places in the ranks. And to say this is not to disparage the values of books, of liberal teaching. If the war is justified, it is being waged for the sake of the values to which our colleges are dedicated. Those values require that we win a quick and decisive victory. And, that being true, a young man who is fit to fight will find his way toward liberal understanding, not by staying apart in safety to study what his fellows are doing but by sharing with them the common dangers, the common disaster. Liberal understanding does not thrive on special privilege. That disease has disastrously weakened our colleges in time of peace. The army will set us all a good example if the disease is rooted out in time of war. I am not saying that a young man will get a good education by going into the hell of war. I am only saying that, if he is fit to fight, he will get a bad education by staying out of it.

If we try to look forward, beyond the winning of the war, toward the planning of the liberal teaching of the future, we shall find that the crisis of the war brings into sharp relief certain aspects of our colleges which, in the past, have been blurred or ignored.

First, our military plans have given new sharpness to the terms "technical" and "liberal" as used in the field of education. For the army, technical military training is whatever will make a soldier ready to fight. What, then, would liberal teaching do for the same soldier? It would prepare him to understand what he is fighting for, what he is fighting about. Military training helps us to win a victory. Liberal teaching, if we had it, would help us to use that victory in the service of human peace and freedom. The former prepares for a limited and specific job. The latter requires of us that we try to see all jobs in relation to one another. It interprets them as working together in the coherence of a single human enterprise. The military men are saying, and saying properly, "Let us get this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

job done." Just what the college men are saying it is hard to tell.

Second, the crisis of the war has called our attention to the financial dependence of our so-called "independent" colleges. As those institutions stagger under the impact of the draft it becomes clear that whatever academic freedom they have had in the past was not the product of financial freedom. They depend upon student fees. And so heavy has been the burden of balancing the budget that, in the last few decades, those fees have been doubled or tripled. They depend upon alumni gifts. And from this has arisen, in the same decades, the dangerous device of annual subscription to an Alumni Fund. They depend upon private donors and semi-private foundations. Since they are "endowed," the amount of their income depends upon the interest rate on business investments. It is chiefly these dependencies which have molded into shape or into shapelessness that peculiar American institution known as "the college president." The independent college, as a financial institution, leads a dependent and precarious existence. That fact must not be forgotten when, with the return of peace, we remake our plans for liberal teaching.

Third, if we say that liberal learning strives toward the understanding of war, and of peace, we can see how pitiful has been the failure of our colleges in the midst of the forces which have led up to the present world crisis. Many causes have produced the World War. But high among them all is the failure of our Anglo-American institutions of liberal learning. It is not the forces of the modern world which have wrecked us. It is our lack of understanding of those forces. In 1939 and 1940 the students in our colleges, at least the majority of their intellectual leaders, were in open rebellion against the participation of the United States in the growing conflict. They saw the world being led to slaughter by an older generation in whose judgment they had no confidence whatsoever. That older generation had suffered one war but had apparently learned nothing from it. Confronted by the inescapable choice between war and peace, it had refused to choose. It has prepared neither for war nor for peace. It had simply drifted into chaos. In 1939 and 1940 professors and literary men were explaining the lack of moral and mental stamina in the younger generation. Those explanations were, all of them, beside the point. The young rebels of that period were expressing, not a lack of stamina, but a shrewd, though untutored, skepticism toward the moral and mental stamina of their elders. What moved them to rebellion was not an unwillingness to fight. Their later conduct has shown that. But they did not want to fight foolishly, for no valid purpose. They were asking for enlightenment, for education, for a sense of direction. And the colleges could not give it to them. Those colleges were not studying war and peace. They were not charting a course for the United States or for the world. They were studying economics or art, literature or chemistry, metaphysics or gardening. They were doing intellectual "jobs." They were "technical." They were not "liberal."

No one who views the world crisis soberly, attempting to rise above national prejudice, can doubt that our only hope of escape from future wars lies in a fundamental change of cultural attitude in all the nations involved. The sin of the Axis powers is that they have carried to a brutal and fiendish extreme principles of action which, in less explicit, less exaggerated, degree all the dominant nations have been following. Our war will be justified only in so far as we succeed in abandoning those principles, in establishing cultural attitudes which are rooted, not in strife and competition, but in fellowship and coöperation. Fundamentally the task of international reconstruction is one of reëducation.

If, then, we ask how the liberal colleges of the United States can be so transformed that they will play their proper part in this vast and difficult undertaking, this brief discussion cannot attempt an adequate answer. There is, however, one procedure which seems to me essential, as basic to all others.

A first step in the direction to which I refer should be taken in the process of demobilization. The army and navy have rightly suspended liberal education during the war. They have taken young men out of schools and colleges. They have trained them, have fed and housed and clothed them, have paid them, to fight. When the war is over, every one of those young men should be given the opportunity to go back to school or college, to continue his liberal education until he has won a college degree. And if he takes the opportunity he should again be paid for his service to his country. He should be housed and clothed and fed. His instruction should be furnished from government funds. The winning of the war is only a small fragment of the task which he and we have undertaken to do. The understanding of that victory, the using of it in the service of peace and freedom, is the major part of the task, without which the doing of the other is futile. We need thinking quite as desperately as we need fighting. Intelligent loyalty to our institutions is not merely a private privilege—though it is the highest of such privileges. It is also a public duty, a public service. Without it democratic institutions cannot endure.

But with the coming of stable peace, this first step should be followed by others in the same direction. We can no longer ignore the fact that liberal learning, at the college level, is, first of all, a matter of federal concern. It cannot be left wholly in the hands of private associations, of cities, or even of states. The federal government, in the past, has refused to accept its responsibility at this point. It has made grants for technical education. In the agricultural field, for ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ample, its recent activities have greatly increased our productive capacity as a nation. But it has never contributed directly to the support or direction of liberal teaching. That policy must be reversed. It expresses, in its most pernicious form, the false localism by which we have misinterpreted the meaning of democracy. Some way must be found to send surging through the irresponsible scholarship of our professors the driving force of our national purpose, our national devotion to freedom and equality. And the only way available, so far as I can see, is that the federal government shall, both by word and deed, accept responsibility for liberal learning.

As I make this proposal, that liberal education in the United States shall be in large measure subsidized and directed by the federal government, I am not unmindful of the difficulties and dangers of governmental bureaucracy. They are very great. But the difficulties and dangers of private control are even greater. Any fair comparison of our state universities and our private colleges will show this to be true. I would urge, therefore, that in the planning of the liberal education of the future we follow the model which the "new plan" of the army and navy has given us. The federal government should bargain with existing colleges for the education of young women and men in time of peace just as it is now bargaining for the education of soldiers in time of war. That bargain need not, and should not, require uniformity in methods and content of teaching. The colleges and universities must be left free, each to devise and conduct its own course of instruction, provided only that the government is satisfied that the teaching is directed toward the liberal understanding which is needed by the citizens of a democratic society. Such an arrangement would give to our private colleges new stability, new independence, a new and sorely needed sense of public responsibility. Under the arrangement private initiative would establish new colleges, in response to need, throughout the country, and these would be kept in operation so long as, in the judgment of the public authorities, they were rendering adequate public service. We should thus be making our way toward a national system of liberal education, free from special privilege, free from private domination. Our goal would be to offer, on reasonable conditions, to every young woman and man who is found fit for the service, the opportunities and the responsibilities of liberal understanding. Other than this there is no way by which democratic institutions can be established and maintained. A democracy is a society whose citizens are liberally educated.

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

The Christian American Cabal

ALABAMA'S GOVERNOR Frank Dixon, Texas' Senator "Pappy" O'Daniel and the would-be demagogues who trail along with them have now got past the talking stage in their plans to lick the Roosevelt forces within the Democratic Party in 1944. They now have some definite plans on where they are going from here and how. They are out to rally as many Southern delegations as possible around the idea of staying home from the 1944 Democratic National Convention, sending uninstructed delegations to the Electoral College to sit as a bloc in an effort to prevent a majority vote for any candidate, thus throwing the election into the House of Representatives,[1] where every state would be entitled to a single vote.

The Southern Republicans who have so long been masquerading as "Democrats" are beginning to come out from under cover in their eagerness to do a real job of influencing the current Congress, and leading Democratic and Republican reactionaries are busy figuring out how to use the traditional Southern bloc *against* the President. They are dead set on passing a tax bill which will make ordinary people pay the major part of the tax and allow corporation profits to swell. And they are equally determined to pass the O'Daniel-model anti-labor legislation in this Congress.

These plans involve a Texas lobbyist by the name of Vance Muse, who in his own small way is almost as romantic a figure as Mr. O'Malley. Dixon and "Pappy" plan to use Vance Muse, whose present title is Secretary-Treasurer of the Christian Americans, to do their dirty work in bringing about closer relationship between the forces of reaction in the Southern states looking toward 1944 and toward influencing Congress in this session. They have made a wise choice. By experience and inclination Vance Muse is clearly their man.

The leaders of the Southern forces of darkness which Pappy and Frank Dixon at the moment are generaling know that the success of their plans to drive the progressive spirit out of the Democratic Party depends on whether or not they can make a group of independent Southern states into a single unified fighting force. That means tightening the ties that bind the South to reaction all along the line, within the several states themselves and among states as well.

In Alabama Frank Dixon has set a high standard of performance for other state leaders. During his term as Governor, he helped the Birmingham corporation-lawyer spokesmen for Northern-owned industry get on more intimate terms with home-owned industry and

[1] This scheme was discussed in an article, "Bloody Shirt in Dixie," by Thomas Sancton in our issue of January 11. – THE EDITORS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weld those two groups into one. Under his administration, much has been done to overcome the traditional antagonisms between the political bosses of the south Alabama Blackbelt and of north Alabama industry.

These things accomplished, Dixon was in a position to step forward as a self-proclaimed leader of the forces of reaction in the South as a whole, and to get on with the job of setting up a unified command for all those states he and his friends aimed to bring in with them. Through the Conference of Southern Governors, Dixon was already on excellent terms with Gov. Sam Jones of Louisiana, with whom he hunts and fishes, as well as with the leaders of Georgia, Texas and Mississippi. As a token of his coöperative spirit, on November 19 Governor Dixon invited his fellow demagogue, Sen. W. Lee O'Daniel, to address a joint session of the Alabama legislature. O'Daniel's appearance was arranged through State Sen. Jim Simpson, representative of the Birmingham Big Mules, as Alabamans call the dominant corporate interests. When O'Daniel arrived in Montgomery, Vance Muse, the "Christian American," was with him, and when later O'Daniel conferred with Dixon in the Governor's office, Muse was included, along with a few influential leaders of the Alabama legislature.

I do not have a transcript of what took place in that conference, but Mr. Muse has reported the general result of it in a memorandum labeled "Confidential Report to Friends of the Christian American Movement," written by him the following day from the Jefferson Davis Hotel in Montgomery. With it he enclosed copies of an editorial and news stories from Alabama papers which were favorable to Senator O'Daniel, and he reported:

> During our visit here we have made contact with the influential leaders and we are assured that at the session early in 1943 the following measures, sponsored by the Christian American organization, will be introduced and favorably acted upon:
>
> 1. A memorial to Congress to submit an amendment to the federal Constitution limiting the taxing powers of Congress to a maximum rate of 25 percent on individual and corporate incomes, gifts and inheritances (copy attached).
>
> 2. Enactment of the Texas-Mississippi anti-violence-in-strikes laws as an Alabama statute (copy attached).
>
> 3. Memorialize Congress to submit the O'Daniel Freedom to Work Amendment, now pending in the United States Senate, as an amendment to the United States Constitution (copy attached).

Muse went on to say:

> Senator O'Daniel made a profound impression and many legislators later expressed wonderment to me how an elected official could take such a bold stand for constitutional government and sound, but unpopular, principles and hold the support of his constituency. These men also manifested keen interest in the work the Christian American has carried on in Texas for years, and more recently in Mississippi, and they want to hear and see more of us in Alabama. THEY WILL!
>
> Respectfully submitted,
> VANCE MUSE, Secretary-Treasurer,
> The Christian American,
> Kirby Building, Houston Texas

So Vance Muse and company are going to Alabama, and from there into the rest of the South if that mission is successful.

Certainly such wiseacres as Frank Dixon and Pappy O'Daniel would not have selected a man for this important job of serving as the "connecting link" between the Southern princes of darkness and their forces without going thoroughly into his record. Let's have a look.

Vance Muse has made a living off what he could wheedle from rich men's pockets for more than thirty years now, that is, since he was just past twenty and looking for his first job down in Forth Worth. He learned his lobbying the hard way, under the tough tutelage of his first boss, Jim Arnold, who in the early twenties thought up the Southern Tariff Association (to work for high protective duties) and the American Taxpayers' Association (to work for low corporate income taxes) and originally sweetened up their first and still foremost angel, John Henry Kirby, the elderly $30,000,000 Houston lumber man. With slight interruption, Muse has stuck with this same combination ever since. He and Arnold figured the angles on many a problem that had troubled many a "public relations" man before them. Muse learned how to raise money with one hand while he was organizing committees, delegations and conferences, espousing whatever measure he was espousing at the moment, with the other. He learned the tactful way of putting folding money where it would do the most good and how to say a nice thank-you to state and local officials in return for favors received—and, not least important, how to convince big-money men in the North that his projects were worth supporting.

Before former Sen. Thaddeus Caraway got around to bringing these gentlemen to account, the American Taxpayers' Association had got its nose deep into the boodle trough. Muse had public officials and notable citizens resoluting, conferring and tripping to Washington to express their views at a great rate. And the money was flowing in too. The Mellons, the duPonts, Sam Insull, the Armours, the Spreckelses and the Wideners, Stone and Webster, and Pittsburgh Plate Glass thought enough of Muse's work to contribute thousands of dollars to its continuation. Not-so-fat Southern industry contributed its hundreds, and little country banks all over the South were allowed to chip in ten-dollar drafts just to make it democratic.

The Tariff Association and the Taxpayers' Association naturally had good Republican contacts in Washington during those good Republican years. Senators Watson, Moses and Reed were especially assigned by the party leaders to assist the Muse gang. And in return

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Muse and his friends worked at promoting the Republican cause among business men in the South. Senator Caraway's curiosity damaged Muse's usefulness to his sponsors so greatly that the tactful Muse soon found it advisable to fade back into the South, back into the protective and financially secure custody of John Henry Kirby and his Houston millions.

With the Roosevelt administration looming up, it was time for the Kirbys of America to open their cash boxes and prepare to defend themselves. And so was born the Southern Committee to Uphold the Constitution, affectionately known by Muse's sons as the "Southern Committee to Put Two Boys Through College," with Kirby as chairman and Muse as chief cook and bottle-washer.

Perhaps its best known project was the so-called "Grass Roots" convention which Governor Talmadge called at Macon, Georgia, in 1935. That was the time, you remember, when the photograph of Mrs. Roosevelt with two Negroes was circulated as evidence of something or other. Muse was the fellow who pulled off this meeting for Talmadge. He induced John J. Raskob, of the Liberty League Raskobs, and Pierre duPont to put up the initial thousands necessary to finance this pillorying of the New Deal. Additional sums subscribed to the Southern Committee by Howard C. Hopson of Associated Gas and Electric, E. W. Mudge of Weirton Steel, Ogden Mills and Alfred P. Sloan, among others, made it possible for Muse to hire men to work up attendance for Talmadge's Macon rally and to underwrite a great flood of publicity about the meeting. It was at Macon over a breakfast table in the Dempsey Hotel that Muse first met Gerald L. K. Smith, the American proto-fascist.

A few days after Muse and Kirby got back home to Houston, a new organization, the Election Managers' Association, opened headquarters in the office next door to Muse in the Kirby Building and got down to business selling copies of that picture of Mrs. Roosevelt which had been put to such infamous use at Macon. Then just when things were going so smoothly for the Muse gang, the Senate stepped in to plague them again. This time it was Sen. Hugo Black who summoned Kirby to testify. Muse went along for the ride, and when the old man was unable to answer the Senator's questions, Muse took the stand, told how they established the Southern Committee, confessed to the names of their contributors, admitted circulating the picture of Mrs. Roosevelt and explained that he did it because "my granddaddy who wore the Confederate gray forced me to do it."

By the time Senator Black was through with Muse, it was apparent to the duPonts and their fellow contributors that Muse would be little good to them for a while. So Muse had to go home again to Old Man Kirby and Houston. But it was not long before the two of them thought up a new game. When they put out their shingle again, they had become the Christian Americans. And they had found themselves a new leader and a job to do. Pappy O'Daniel was their man. They did their best to build him up and then to go out in front of him and prepare public opinion in advance of each of his successive moves against the people's interest.

This is the work-experience record of Vance Muse.

Pappy O'Daniel and Frank Dixon would have a hard time finding another man so well suited to their purposes. Clearly Muse is a man who can be depended upon by his employers to stir up race tension, to sow dissension and to prey on ignorance and prejudice to advance the native demagoguery his friends O'Daniel and Dixon represent. And what is more, Muse's thirty years of lobbying have taught him the techniques for doing these things. He knows how to make a tiny minority sound almost like a majority. He knows how to make himself and his cause of the moment attractive to a certain kind of public official. He knows how to manipulate some of the mechanisms for influencing public opinion, and he knows how to get money from rich men with which to do these things.

Vance Muse will be right at home when he and the Christian Americans hit Alabama, for he is not without old friends there. Birmingham industrialists like Robert Ingalls of Ingalls Iron and Steel, Charles de Bardeleben of de Bardeleben Coal and Coke, and Crawford Johnson of Coca-Cola were willing contributors to Muse's Southern Committee back in 1935. Alabama's Ed O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, worked with Muse back in the days of the Southern Tariff Association and joined with him in petitions and conferences in Alabama. These men, together with Muse's new friends, the "influential leaders" in the Alabama legislature whom he met through Dixon and Senator Simpson, should guarantee him entree all around the state with the President's enemies.

His record and the auspices under which he is coming into Alabama should guarantee him a hot reception from the President's friends—most of the people of Alabama—once they find out what Muse is up to. I can't believe that the mothers and fathers of Alabama's young men who are fighting fascism far away from home right now are going to like it when they see that some of Alabama's old men are trying to welcome American fascism into their state with open arms. Maybe they will find a way to do something about it when next election comes around.

If we are going to win out against those who would repeal our labor laws, our foreign-trade agreements, those who would saddle us with sales taxes and increased Victory taxes instead of well reasoned levies, we will have to look sharp. The Vance Muses and their like have been shown up and scared back into their holes by Senate investigating committees before. Let's do it again. Let's bring the dormant Senate Lobby Investigating Committee back to life.

Washington HELEN FULLER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

The Farm Bloc

WAYNE B. WHEELER and his prohibition lobby once intimidated Congress and produced the minor disaster of national prohibition. Edward O'Neal and his farm lobby now intimidate Congress and threaten the nation with a major disaster. If there is anything this time in the slogan, Food Will Win the War, then this war is not yet won and the farm lobby's current plans can lose it. These plans, if carried out, will raise food prices to the point where millions of Americans won't have the wherewithal to provide their families with healthy diets; they will almost certainly create a disastrous inflation; they may limit food production so drastically that we shall not have enough, at any price, to meet the requirements of army, lease-lend and civilian consumption.

This menacing lobby is composed of four organizations —the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Council of Farm Coöperatives and the National Coöperative Milk Producers' Association. O'Neal, the big boss, is a Farm Bureau official. It is no exaggeration, as of today, to attribute to O'Neal the power to control a majority of votes in both the House and Senate even though he and his lobby represent the interests of a small minority of well-to-do farmers.

O'Neal's power derives from two primary causes. First, his farm organizations claim credit for administration policies which raised farm income to an all-time high of $15,000,000,000 last year. Second, every member of the Senate and a big majority of House members are dependent in part on farm constituencies for reëlection. Organized labor, even when the AFL and the CIO pull together, is no match for the farmers because so few congressmen represent wholly urban constituencies. Consumers are not effectively organized and therefore are not a factor.

What is commonly called the congressional farm bloc is, in fact, not a bloc at all but rather the majority controlled or influenced by the farm lobby. Often it has included the Tammany delegation, whose members have not found it in their hearts to deny anything to the farmers whom they think of as horny-handed sons of the soil who get up with the dawn and dig in the good earth until the sun has set, grubbing out the food with which New York City is fed. The farm lobby has played on sympathies as well as fears. Its managers are the cleverest legislative manipulators now operating. Compared with them, the brain men of the National Association of Manufacturers, whom the farm lobbyists sometimes use, are children.

This is what the lobby proposes to do at the current session: revise the parity formula to force upward revisions of farm price ceilings; include cost of labor in parity calculations for the same purpose; increase production of farm machinery; obtain draft exemptions for farm workers. But these are only its announced objectives. It also wants to hobble the Farm Security Administration, the only government agency helping the majority of small farmers, as distinct from the minority of big farmers. This it seems to be achieving from within the Agriculture Department, where its influence is almost as great as in Congress. It also wants to keep production low enough to assure good prices and guard against post-war surpluses. Knocking off the FSA will help to accomplish this too.

Farm-bloc leaders argue that the way to produce more food is to let food prices rise. They forced the resignation of Leon Henderson because he disagreed with this theory. They forced the resignation of Donald Montgomery, consumers' counsel in the Agriculture Department, because he disagreed too. Then they got H. E. Parisius, director of wartime food production, five weeks after his appointment to the job, because he insisted upon a real food-production program. Contending that the big farmers represented by the lobby couldn't be depended upon to meet additional wartime food requirements, Parisius proposed to extend government credit to small farmers, transfer farm hands to sections where help was scarce and, at the same time, hold prices down. Secretary of Agriculture Claude Wickard agreed with Parisius but he couldn't bring himself to fight it out with the farm lobby on such a front.

So Wickard now will try to make some kind of compromise with the farm bloc. It is estimated that the lobby's scheme for revising parity would add about $1,500,000,000 to the farmers' take next year. By the time this was passed along to the consumer it would amount to $3,000,000,000. As usual, a relatively few big farmers—the corporate agriculturists whose tractors chased the Oakies into California, the planters like Senator Harry Byrd of Virginia, whose apple orchards spead over the Shenandoah Valley, and the more prosperous home farm operators—would get most of the increase. Last year the nation's 5,000,000 farmers earned a net income, over operating expenses and living costs, of $4,800,000,000. All but $700,000 of this went into the pockets of 1,730,000 farmers, an average of $2,380 apiece. Most of the others, of course, had no net. But neither do they have any voice in the lobby. Their interests are represented in Washington by the National Farmers' Union, which O'Neal doesn't like.

Whatever compromise Wickard makes, it will have to let farm prices break through current ceilings to satisfy the lobby. The probability is that it will also have to satisfy Byrd's thirst for the blood of the FSA. But farm prices already have risen 42 percent since Hitler marched into Poland and 17 percent since the Japanese shot up Pearl Harbor. With wages frozen, it is difficult to see how the 25,000,000-odd American families still earning less than $1,000 a year can feed themselves even at present prices. And if the FSA goes under, it is hard to see how farm production is going to be increased materially in 1943.

What can be done to tame the wolf in overalls that is the farm lobby is a problem. Obviously Wickard hasn't the stomach for it. There isn't much chance that O'Neal, Senator Elmer Thomas of Oklahoma, the isolationist who speaks for the farm bloc, Frank Gannett, the New York publisher who has placed his hate-Roosevelt propaganda organization at the disposal of the overall boys, and other professional friends of the farmer will suddenly repent. It is too late to organize consumers. Organized labor is still fighting itself. The only hope seems to lie in a spontaneous uprising of housewives and consumers.

Washington T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

History and Hollywood

IN SPITE of its infinite pains to tread lightly among the delicate issues, "Tennessee Johnson," the movie life of the underestimated and misinterpreted Andrew Johnson (which was first called "The Man on America's Conscience") has a warmly human quality, a lack of pretense and a fine spirit. In some places the movie is intense with emotion, and otherwise is almost always interesting in showing famous figures of American history in famous or infamous moments. One scene is a great movie episode—Jefferson Davis' secession speech to Congress. It is spoken amazingly well by Morris Ankrum, with all the rigid formality of the speech and the cultured superiority and dogmatism of the man dominating the first half; but the end, in the quivering lips and body, is full of the terrible effort he was making to keep his emotion within the bounds of his speech.

Its Johnson is a passionate, mulish fighter for the underprivileged, the Union and the Constitution, but because the movie is afraid, it hardly mentions slavery, states' rights, the problems of reconstruction, the war; that Johnson hated the Abolitionists as much as the Secessionists; that he believed in emancipating the Negro but had no plan for rehabilitating him. Instead it concentrates on two freak incidents that are more sensational than indicative of the man and his times. One is the crazy circumstances that brought an upright Vice President to his inauguration maudlin drunk (he was never known to be so before or after) and led to Johnson's reeling, extemporaneous speech about his youth. The other has to do with the famous, hoked-up impeachment proceedings (in the movie Johnson shows up at his trial). And while it gets stuck in slow, long-winded debates in Congress and the White House it misses the tragic era outside and a great deal of the man—especially what he was most interested in, the poor white.

It has the hard luck to be intelligent, interesting and unpretentious without being convincing. For instance, the Tennessee scenes of Johnson's youth are fair enough to his early life: he *was* a runaway tailor's apprentice whose wife *did* teach him to read and write, his first speeches *were* given in meetings that broke up into gun fights, as a Jacksonian Democrat he *did* fight bitterly Lincoln's election—but all these scenes seem too custom-made and familiar, just as its people are too easily recognizable as Regis Toomey, Marjorie Main and Grant Withers rather than Tennessee settlers, and their speech more contrivance than Southern.

The picture looks to have been pretty thoroughly censored, so as not to rake up any coals still burning. There is one telling long-shot of Thaddeus Stevens which shows him wearing an ugly, black wig similar to the one he actually did wear and to the one that "The Birth of a Nation" Stevens wore. Elsewhere there is no wig but softly flowing brown locks. To please the OWI, Director Dieterle reshot several sequences to make Abolitionist Stevens a more sympathetic character. In my opinion, censorship is a disgrace, whether done by the Hays office and pressure groups, or by liberals and the OWI. Certainly it is a comedown from the unhypocritical, cynical, dictatorial, powerful Stevens to the indefinite Stevens Lionel Barrymore projects, using only the material considered safe, which is a bundle of gestures and grimaces rather than a personality.

Van Heflin plays Johnson with knowledge, and makes him a grim, humorless, somewhat puzzled personality, who seemed never to get over the knocking about he took in his youth; not given to tact, but a proud, courageous President who faced the post-war chaos that would have fallen to Lincoln. Heflin's was a difficult job, with the camera almost never away from him and a lot of long talks to be given, but he makes it, and lifts the picture generally, giving the portrait more dimension than is actually written into it.

It is certainly one of the less obvious pictures in a year of obvious ones. Its hero is not a box-office figure, and at least it tackled a controversial period. For these reasons it deserves respect. And it is a thoroughly interesting movie.

MANNY FARBER

Labor on Foreign Fronts

INDICATIONS that the Germans are still working furiously on Channel fortifications come from Belgium, where workers are being commandeered for such jobs. In one large town 100 shops were recently closed by the police. The owners and employees, including those beyond middle age, were rushed to the coast as laborers.

Dr. Dorpmüller, the Reich Minister of Transport, is pleading with German railway workers to increase the facilities of the German railways. The Nachrichtenbüro Deutscher Zeitungsverlager, reporting his appeal, promises that railwaymen who "coöperate constructively" will have their names mentioned in official publications.

Some of the difficulties of obtaining constructive cooperation from workmen in Germany are suggested by the fact that every fourth working person, man or woman, in Germany is now a foreigner. This fourth workman casts a dark shadow in the mind of the German who permits himself to doubt the final triumph of Hitlerism. The Svenska Dagbladet, commenting on the presence of these six million foreigners, writes: "This large number of foreign workers, 'with hate in their hearts and revenge in their minds,' will, in the event of a collapse, constitute a weakness and a danger compared with which the revolts of 1918 and 1919 will appear child's-play."

The Nazis make no further effort to disguise their violation of international law by employing war prisoners at forced labor. "The war effort necessitates the utilization of all available sources of labor. Therefore all war prisoners will to the fullest extent be employed in our production processes," says the Münchener Neuste Nachrichten. "Prisoners of war must be treated in such a way that their full capacity will be available to our industry and agriculture. This presupposes adequate nourishment."

A Swedish seaman, returned from a trip to Germany, reports in the Swedish newspaper, Trots Allt, what he saw in the way of the forced labor of prisoners of war. The prisoners who came to unload his ship were guarded only by a civilian foreman—and by their knowledge that if they escaped they would simply starve. They were clothed in rags and were weak from hunger. One Frenchman tried to lift a moderate weight, collapsed and vomited. Kicks by the German boss brought him back to his feet.

The prisoners gathered in a circle around the Swedes when the latter were eating and asked for the dishwater

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and garbage pail. They were paid in slips of paper valid only in labor camps, which are usually thrown away as worthless.

Foreign domestic workers in the Reich, save for Poles and women from conquered Russian territory, are in theory entitled to employment on the same terms as German women. Polish domestics are granted no vacations and no leaves. There are many cases of savage punishment of foreign domestics who have struck back, when given corporal correction by their German employers.

The Bandwagon

"To fight hard on the front," he said, "one must have complete order behind the front. Order is not complete if high commissioners like Darlan are assassinated." – *A statement by Gen. Henri Giraud, reported by Charles Collingwood over CBS and printed in PM.*

NO SHOWS UNTIL THE WEATHER MODERATES TO TEMPERATURE OF 35 BELOW OR LESS

– *Advertisement of the Orpheum Theatre in The Dawson News, Yukon Territory.*

Straight from the Horse's Mouth

The charge that private possessions in the occupied territories have been seized or sequestered by Germany is refuted by the assertion "that the people of those countries were so impoverished that the condition of private property did not provoke any craving." – *From an official Berlin communiqué, reported in The New York Times.*

Death in the Sticks

Arthur Doolittle, 45, was arrested on a first degree murder charge today in connection with the fatal shooting Sunday of his wife, Martha, 38. He waived examination on this and a second degree attempted grand larceny charge and was held for the grand jury.

Sheriff Dana T. Burt said Doolittle claimed he had mistaken Mrs. Doolittle for a deer. The prisoner told Burt he had left his wife in their car and gone into a field to shoot a deer. Mrs. Doolittle was shot twice.

A heifer on a nearby farm was shot earlier, and Burt reported Doolittle said he killed this animal also in mistake for a deer. District Attorney L. W. Argetsinger said the attempted grand larceny charge was placed in connection with the heifer killing. – *AP dispatch from Watkins Glen, New York.*

It Even Bars Carol

RUMANIA BARS CAROL SINGING

– *Headline in The New York Times.*

Total-War Department

In the suburbs of Ottawa, Princess Juliana of the Netherlands awaited the birth of her third child. If the child should be a boy, he might some day rule the Netherlands, but birth on British soil might make him technically a Briton, would complicate matters. Therefore to smooth the path of the Dutch succession, the Dominion government last week decreed that during the hours of childbirth (expected this month) Canada will grant extraterritorial rights to the birthplace and suspend all its sovereign claims to that part of the earth under the delivery room. – *From Time.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – THE EDITORS

Correspondence

The Dog That Bit People

SIR: My grandfather's house was about two miles from the main road. It sat upon a small hill. The country lane from the main road ran head-on toward the front door, then veered off to the left, up the face of the hill into the barn lot.

In front of the house, at the edge of the hill, was a large cluster of lilacs and honeysuckle which, in the warm summer months, was fairly alive with humming birds and bees.

Between the house and the honeysuckle was a large patch of asparagus which grandpa permitted to grow wild to a height of about three feet. Throughout this, the rabbits, quail and other wild life from the adjoining woods had woven a labyrinth of paths in their nightly sojourning.

Grandpa also had a hound dog. At the beginning he was a rather likable dog. He did show a disposition to favor those who fed him best and had no fixed principles in life. However, he was more or less friendly and, except for an early tendency to lick the hand that held the grub, the worst you could say of him was that he was just a hound.

Old Hound spent most of his daylight hours in the asparagus patch. It was nice and cool there and he had wallowed out a nice bed right in the middle. The shoots met overhead, forming a fine shade, while the leafless stems allowed plenty of ventilation.

One Sunday we were having company. They drove up to the barn-lot gate, and were just getting out, when from the depths of the asparagus patch arose a horrific confusion. Next, out shot Old Hound, snarling, snapping and frothing like mad. He made straight for one of the men, grabbed him by the leg and tore off half his pants. Next, he dove for one of the women, got the hem of her skirt in his teeth and practically disrobed her.

As soon as grandpa recovered, he said, naturally, "What the heck's the matter with that dog?" They tried to beat him off, but he merely ducked and came back for more. Grandma finally had a bright idea. She got the old skillet she used to feed him in, ran to the back door where he always got his hand-outs, and began beating the skillet with a knife handle, the way she always called him. With the first sound of the skillet, Old Hound stopped dead in his tracks, then made a bee line for the kitchen door. We found later that a bumble bee had sat down on the near end of his tail.

A few Sundays later, we had guests again. As they were getting out, the same sort of din arose from the asparagus patch, only this time Old Hound came out running in circles and chewing his tail. He almost gnawed it off, then took after the guests again. Again grandma got the skillet and Old Hound high-tailed for the kitchen door.

Thereafter, that was his regular procedure. He would chew his tail until he got mad, then chase the guests until grandma clanged the skillet.

Grandpa finally lost patience. One Sunday, after a particu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

larly vicious session, he said to grandma, "Mother, I'm givin' that dog a new name." She said, "Is that so, Pa? What is it?" And he said, "Ma, from now on that dog's name is Westbrook."

Pittsburgh, Pa. HERSHEL G. HOLLAND

"Report to the Front"

SIR: The editorial in the December 28 issue entitled "Report to the Front" is the best I've read since the United States entered the world conflict. We men in the service need such enlightening reports and I would suggest that a regular column be started with the same title. Such reports, however, would be more beneficial and effective if they could be circulated among the men at the front. Some day most of us will return to voice our sentiments in future elections and "Report to the Front" would be an excellent manner in which to prepare the men in service for the proper execution of this privilege.

Keep up the good work. LT. IRVING COWAN

U. S. Naval Training Sta., San Diego, Calif.

Harp, Harp, the Larp!

SIR: Through war and peace, the cowleys are with us, and despite rationing and priorities, keep their careers upholstered. Again we find Mr. Malcolm Cowley (of the New Republic cowleys) propagandizing against art, on which he has waged a cliquish war for lo, these many years.

When Mr. Cowley has nothing to say, he says it on the margin (your January 4 issue): that is, he remembers all the poems and art works he has never understood, from certain passages in Shakespeare to Mallarmé and Lautréamont, and, caught without a book to review, he is inundated with the old rancor and bewilderment, the more so because he once sat in the very middle of Montparnasse and had to listen and watch others open and close the doors of art. . . .

Because Mr. Cowley cannot understand what Nicholas Calas is talking about, and because he cannot understand, above all, why there are people who do know what he is talking about (to properly disagree with Mr. Calas you have to understand him), Mr. Cowley frets. He frets even while sitting on his upholstered career. Mr. Cowley simply does not know an esthetic principle from a closed door. The trouble is that inadvertently modern art has bamboozled him into believing it is hermetic and wishes to exile music, rhythm and intellectual patterns. But because Mr. Cowley has no ear, no taste and very little mind, does not signify that young poets of a neo-symbolist, romantic or surrealist cast also lack these things. He merely rationalizes his own defects.

Contrary to Mr. Cowley's barbaric notion, the Country of Art has always had an Open Door policy for those who have sense enough to see the door. That is why art is an international tradition, capable of being revived in any number of ways. It is only Mr. Cowley's delusion that it becomes a semi-opaque, locked door, through which the syllables of poetry arrived blurred. The lines he quotes from Charles Henri Ford and myself are genuinely hermetic in that whatever qualities they have (they are not our respective bests, but Mr. Cowley would not be expected to know that), they are proof against bores, prigs and cowleys. They put between us and them time and space. Who could ask more than that from his art?

New York City PARKER TYLER

[The lines that Mr. Cowley quoted and that Mr. Tyler is heatedly defending might be quoted again. They are:

> The melted harp you inhaled with your ear
> Grew in your wrist like a lady-limbed spear.

—THE EDITORS]

Radio Razzberry, Cont'd.

SIR: May I add my rather distant voice to your chorus of condemnation of radio advertising nuisances?

I challenge the Phillip Morris Cigarette Company to produce the name of ONE of their "eminent medical authorities" who attest to the superiority of their product. As a member of the medical profession, I resent the implication that my colleagues have stooped to the ignominy of commercial cigarette testing.

It would also interest me to hear the name of ONE of the "leading medical journals" which print the findings of these alleged eminent medical authorities.

LT. J. L. HABER

Med. Corps, Sta. Hosp., Camp Van Dorn, Miss.

From The New Republic Mail Bag

One lesson that can be drawn from the resignation of Leon Henderson, writes Andrew A. Bishop of Detroit, who expresses approval of Michael Straight's "Why Henderson Goes" in the December 28, 1942, issue, is that "a liberal agency must do an effective selling job if it is to survive. And that means not merely selling itself to Congress, the administration, or a few key individuals in the country but to 130,000,000 Americans. Conservatives realize this and shrewdly oppose any increase in public-relations personnel or expenditures by New Deal agencies."

Mr. Bishop continues: "No better example of this can be found than the OPA. No other agency ever existed which needed more to do a selling job and no other agency ever had more to sell. The reason is obvious. Although the OPA reached into every home and pocketbook, basically changing the living habits of every American, it offered the consumer the attractive argument of giving him *more* goods for his dollar. This angle has never been adequately explained to the public. It would be interesting to compare the public-relations budgets of the Treasury Department's Bond Drive and the OPA."

Richard Kelly of Port Chester, New York goes poetical, rhyme endings and all, in a critical clash of minds with our movie and art reviewer, Manny Farber. The burden of Mr. Kelly's epic is contained in his first stanza:

> My dear Manny Farber,
> You're too fussy a barber,
> Hollywood if it could but it can't.
> Don't let the Warners get your nanny, Manny,
> Don't be an old Granny, don't harbor
> Such absolute standards, old boy, don't rant.

To which Mr. Farber replies:

> I call them like I see them, Kelly.
> As for verse, I'm liking Shelley.

The National Society for Crippled Children, Inc., of Elyria, Ohio, has prepared its annual group of Easter seals which will go on sale from March 26 to April 25.

A number of French intellectuals residing in the United States have begun the reorganization in New York City of the Société d'Histoire de la Révolution Française. During its long career in France the Société published in Paris about one hundred volumes, together with many documents, memoirs and studies of the French revolutionary period. The first meeting in New York was held under the chairmanship of Professor B. Mirkine-Guetzevitch, who is vice-president of the Société in Paris. The body elected a board of directors to continue the reorganization. Henri Focillon, president of the École Libre des Hautes Études, is president of the board. Many of the leading French emigrés have accepted offices in the organization.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

Europe: Death and Rebirth

FREDERIC PROKOSCH is an American author whose work as a whole has never been adequately discussed in this country. One reason may be that most of it has dealt with Europe or Asia, and that even when writing about American life—as in "Night of the Poor"—he has retained a European point of view. It happens that we badly need such an interpreter. Because of his excessively mixed background—Midwestern by birth, Austrian by descent and by family ties that he has never broken, German by virtue of long visits during his boyhood (and also in his dialectical habit of thinking), English in his literary career, French in his cultural sympathies—Prokosch is peculiarly equipped to understand the psychological conflict that, with many other conflicts, lies behind the war for Europe and the world.

His last two books, a collection of poems and a long novel, were both concerned with this battle inside the European mind. Neither of them was very well reviewed, and the poems in particular were dismissed with howls of rage that seemed to have been aroused by the author's success in England. After reading the notices of "Death at Sea," Prokosch announced that he would publish no more poems in this country. Another poet exclaimed that he too was getting discouraged by spiteful reviews; "I must be suffering," he said, "from dementia prokosch." But the author of "Death at Sea" had a justified complaint, for that volume contained his best work, and most of the critics hadn't bothered to understand what he was saying. His new novel, "The Conspirators," [1] will be much more favorably received, but I shouldn't want to prophesy that it will reach a wide audience. The truth is that none of these books is completely successful in terms of what the author is trying to do. In the poems, the smooth, shadowy and traditional style sometimes hides or deforms the meaning. In the novels, the meaning is often expressed by wholly inadequate symbols. Yet taken together the three books have a weight that none of them carries by itself.

The central idea that Prokosch has been trying to convey, in verse and prose, in terms of image, character and action, is that the European tragedy was not a simple process in which the forces of darkness marched against and overcame the forces of light. Instead the process was reciprocal—aggression and regression, sadism and masochism, conquest and surrender, the will to victory and the will to be defeated. As for the will to survive, it had almost disappeared among the cultural classes everywhere. "All that they see, all that they do," he says in one of his poems, ". . . is a ceaseless flight: flight from identity, from guilt, from the fear of death into death." The same theme is repeated in "The Skies of Europe," which I think is the best of his novels. What lay in Hitler's glance, he says,

> . . . was not merely oppression, lies, ambition and a touch of visionary madness. It was not so eccentric, not so easily dismissed; and not even so unequivocally hostile.
>
> Its power lay in the fact that, woven through this web of enslavement and terrorization, ran a white-hot strand of truth: a monstrous historical vision of the rottenness of wasted lives; the paralysis; the greed; the self-delusion; and the self-betrayal. On whatever was weak and wavering, those slightly insane eyes directed a stare like the beam of an X-ray, exposing the greenish vulnerable organ.

"The Skies of Europe" deals with the years of moral decay that preceded the war; "The Conspirators" resumes the story in the autumn of 1941 and gives it a new turn. By that time the deluge had come; and Prokosch says that "Here in Lisbon, as in Noah's ark, had gathered the remnants. Specimens of every vanishing type; every genus and every aberration, however bizarre, were represented. Extricated and safe, they were watching the flood of history rush past"; while Prokosch, living among them, was watching the refugees.

Epecially he noticed two groups of conspirators, one serving Russia and England, the other in German pay. There were strange connections between them, old friendships and desperate love affairs, like the one between Irina Petrova and Von Mohr; and there was so much treachery within treachery that each group knew exactly what the other was doing. They lived in what one of them called "a new, incredible climate, like the rings of Saturn. It's the age of mist we've entered," he exclaims. "We're no more than tiny figures in the darkness, fluttering and rattling about like dead leaves."

Vincent Van der Lyn, of the anti-Axis group, is more single-minded than the others. Before escaping from a Portuguese prison, he resolves to track down and kill the man who betrayed him—not as an act of personal vengeance, since at first he doesn't even know the man's name, but as an impersonal sacrifice that will advance his cause and save dozens of his comrades. The pursuit lasts only from five o'clock in the afternoon until dawn of the following morning. During that time there are political conversations, clashes with the police, scenes in bars and gambling rooms, a whole panorama of refugee life. There is also, however, a curious lack of explanation; things happen without the reader's knowing why. You observe that Prokosch is only secondarily a novelist. He understands people's inner motives, but he doesn't bother to visualize the circumstances in which they are acted out, so that often his scenes become misty and formalized.

That is particularly true of the murder that is the climax of the novel. Von Mohr, the traitor who sent Vincent to prison, is trapped in his room at a little inn. He makes no attempt to defend himself, to call for help or even to reach—until it is too late—for the little revolver hidden under his pillow. Both he and Vincent act as if they were carrying out a ritual of sacrifice that united the slayer with the slain. Then, when Von Mohr is dead, Vincent suddenly feels a sense of release, as if this violent act had

[1] The Conspirators, by Frederic Prokosch. New York: Harper and Brothers. 338 pages. $2.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

broken down the walls of his loneliness and reunited him with the rest of humanity.

The Russian woman, Irina Petrova, who had been Vincent's mistress before she fell in love with Von Mohr, suddenly appears on the scene, and she too feels a sense of release. At this point you realize that Prokosch is telling another story besides that of three spies in Lisbon. He intends Irina as a symbol, however inadequate, of Europe as a whole; and for the first time he is holding out hope for the European future. "Even from the very core of disaster and loss," he says, "she was drawing a new vitality, and a boundless strength; she was in the act of creating, at this very moment, a new way of living."

MALCOLM COWLEY

Enigma or Logic?

Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy: 1939-1942, by David J. Dallin. New Haven: Yale University Press. 452 pages. $3.75.

WITHIN A FEW WEEKS two books on the Soviet foreign policy of recent years have appeared, Mr. Scott's "Duel for Europe," a more popular exposition, based mainly on personal impressions on the spot, and now Mr. Dallin's more learned yet very readable treatise, based on a thoughtful perusal of available documents. Dr. Dallin has written a somber and most competent book; less personal than that by Mr. Scott, leaving out all discussions and descriptions not immediately pertinent to the main subject, it yet arrives broadly at the same conclusion. Dallin's thesis is that Russia's foreign policy has been, for the twenty-five years since 1917, one of isolation based partly upon a class interpretation of history which refused to treat states or nations as living and changing entities. This "persecution complex" explains the territorial expansion of the Soviet Union in 1939-40, for any "isolationism" must, by rejecting security through alliances, demand security by territorial acquisitions. In the same way American isolationists demanded the annexation of Caribbean outposts, of Central America or of Canada. Yet, as in the case of the American isolationists, the policy of alliance which was regarded as fantastic, proved "the most realistic policy of all."

Dr. Dallin writes with impartiality and great serenity of judgment. He reads the available sources with discerning intelligence and he refuses to see any dark plots or Machiavellian schemes where there was nothing but a complex situation made even more insoluble by the lack of flexibility and realism on the part of the different governments and peoples. The great part which German-spread rumors and misinformation, especially about Britain's position, played in 1939 is clearly brought out by the author. That Russia accepted, and even helped, the elimination of a potential "second front" in Europe, for which she was to clamor two years later, was, according to Dr. Dallin, rooted in the tradition of Russian communism and certainly strengthened by an understandable distrust of the Western powers.

One advantage of Dr. Dallin's treatment of his subject is the global view which he adopts from the beginning. He does not confine himself to an analysis of German-Soviet relations; all the aspects of a potentially worldwide struggle enter into his account. His sections on the Near and Middle East and on the Far East are equally valuable. The nearer the story approaches its tragic climax of June, 1941, the greater becomes the warmth of the narrative and thereby the interest of the reader. The discussion of "the most tragic period in Soviet foreign policy" between Molotov's visit to Berlin and open German aggression against the Soviet Union, is excellent throughout. The author succeeds in showing how Stalin's belief that the pact of August, 1939, might postpone indefinitely the outbreak of actual war, doomed the Soviets to passivity and continuous retreat. But the stark reality of June 22 dispelled the theoretical obsessions with "imperialist wars," "revolutionary wars" and "class wars," taught for twenty-five years in all Soviet textbooks. What emerged was a national war in the defense of the fatherland, a just war, like wars by other nations fighting against aggression. It was on that basis that the Soviet people could coöperate with the other United Nations, especially with Great Britain, the nation which since 1939 has led the "just war." The Anglo-Soviet treaty of May 26, 1942, for mutual assistance and for post-war coöperation is so far the most hopeful and forward-looking concrete step for the organization of peace.

Dr. Dallin does not speculate about the future, but he warns that the policy of isolation which was deeply rooted in the whole Soviet *Weltanschauung* is not dead yet. As there are many American isolationists who wish to fight an American war within, and distinct from, the general war, so there are still many Soviet isolationists who regard Great Britain and America more "as arsenals of war than as military allies." The debate about the second front with its suspicions of "British Tories" was an ominous warning. There is certainly some distrust of the Soviet Union in the United States and in Great Britain. But this is not a one-sided fault; there is probably more distrust of the United States and Great Britain in the Soviet Union. There is on the other hand a somewhat unrealistic love of the Soviet Union in large circles in Great Britain. All the United Nations are passing through a period of transformation, which goes the deeper the more they are directly involved in the actual suffering of war and privation. Russia is certainly living through a crisis involving her political and ideological concepts. Much of the future of the world will depend upon whether the Soviet people will continue, after the war, to think in the terms in which the war has been presented to them since June, 1941, or whether they will return to the pre-June concepts. For victory and a decent peace are impossible without "the rejection of all concepts of a separate war and the elimination of internal friction within the anti-Axis bloc."

Though all of us are anxiously scanning the horizon for the shape of the things to come, nobody can answer questions about the future; the past, even the immediate past, is no sure guide especially in times of great crisis which shatter the fictions with which man protects his inertia, and change his outlook. But there is no understanding of the future without an intelligent appreciation of the past. As far as the past of Soviet foreign policy is concerned, Dr. Dallin has written as authoritative and wise an appreciation as can be done under present circumstances.

HANS KOHN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Small Fry: Twenty Years Later

The Lonely Ones, by William Steig. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce. 102 pages. $1.

AT FIRST GLANCE, and set beside the lunacies of Thurber or Price, the famous Small Fry of William Steig seem to shine from the pages of The New Yorker with a beguiling normality. Here are little boys and girls who roast wieners at a picnic or shoot each other with weapons no deadlier than sticks: they fill us with a warm pleasure in the charming absurdity of childhood. But perhaps only at first glance—for even while we smile, we are vaguely disquieted by something that lurks behind the cockiness of Mr. Steig's youngsters; their innocence is paraded but not convincing; whatever they are up to, they leave us grown-ups holding the bag. Of course all children have a secret, but surely the Small Fry know more than can be good for them. When they are pleased, they smirk, and when they are bad, they roll evil about on their little tongues as if they had long ago had it out with Original Sin. Can an adult possibly have a comfortable relation with children who sail through life with their noses held so high: can you imagine, for instance, daring to cuddle a Small Fry, for all that these kids cry out to be loved? Even their exaggerated lack of size—and what is so small as a Steig small boy?—eventually comes to impress us with a minor note of the sinister.

Well, now we have been presented with a new book of pictures, "The Lonely Ones," a collection of forty-six very small drawings of grown-ups in which Mr. Steig tells us what happens to infant knowingness and arrogance when it comes of age. If the child is father to the man, it turns out that the Small Fry are really baby paranoiacs; lurking behind their cockiness is an ego that may one day be unable to exercise itself within the normal boundaries of social intercourse.

Mr. Steig's vision of mankind is awesome and awful; certainly to one reviewer this latest work of a humorist is anything but funny. But it isn't singular, except in degree. You need only have ridden with your eyes open in a New York subway during rush hour to recognize many of Mr. Steig's obsessed types; for that matter, you need only be old enough to know how difficult it is to make friends to understand what he is driving at. What separates people, Mr. Steig is saying, is their self-absorption—their obsession with their own private powers, ambitions and frustrations. In the sense in which he calls his book "The Lonely Ones" we are all of us at least, and at best, passive lonely ones, while Mr. Steig, in his role of artist, is both actively and passively lonely—and loneliest of all. For unlike an artist such as Daumier, who knew the same things Mr. Steig knows, the author of "The Lonely Ones" lacks the compassion that would spare even himself so much cruelty of insight.

Each of the pictures has an explanatory title. One of the drawings, for instance, is called "I Want What's Coming to Me"; it shows a fishlike man, his finny fingers touching on his belly and his brow a mathematical section of frustrated self-regard, who sits on a small throne brooding over his rights. Or another—"I Have Nothing to Give"—is a skeletal dunce rejoicing in the fact that he has nothing but empty hands to turn to the world. "If You Are Good-Natured, People Step All Over You" is the victim of a vain fancy of generosity: he has been enormously stabbed in the back and where his brains might be, there is now merely a hole that harbors the spot of his self-pity. Obviously self-pity is the swing of the pendulum from cockiness; even the most deflated of Mr. Steig's lonely souls is an egomaniac, cut off from the rest of mankind by self-love. And although for the most part Mr. Steig is exploring the realm between the neurotic and the psychotic—the territory between what we can get away with and what we are put away for—sometimes obsession carries his subjects over the brink of sanity, as in the terrifying lady with an umbrella who is captioned, "Mother Loved Me, But She Died." But pictures like "I Have My Own Troubles"—a kind of prancing Lionel Strongfort beating a drum—or "Glamor Is Only in the Spectator's Eye"—Mr. Steig's version of the contemporary fixation on science—can hit their mark well this side of madness.

Mr. Steig's captions are indispensable to an understanding of his pictures, though even with the aid of the titles this reviewer admits to missing the point of several of them. But to call "The Lonely Ones" program drawing isn't to say that the drawing is merely an adjunct to literary insight. Mr. Steig's frost-bitten line, a touch reminiscent of George Grosz, is wonderfully suited to the mood in which he looks at life. His outlines, too—those curious fœtal-like forms, suggested, not flaunted, that appear so often and, one guesses, so significantly in modern drawing—are thoroughly appropriate to a view of man caught out on rather a lower limb of development than is comfortable for him.

DIANA TRILLING

End of a Controversy

Mexican Oil, by Harlow S. Person. New York: Harper and Brothers. 83 pages. $1.50.

NOT MUCH OF A BOOK TO LOOK AT—only eighty-three pages—for all its hard covers, a mere pamphlet. Yet its implications are so sweeping that they may come to symbolize a dividing line between two epochs in diplomacy.

The book begins and ends, so to speak, in its two short appendices. Appendix A, less than four pages, is a letter from Cordell Hull to the Mexican Ambassador at Washington, suggesting that the two governments shall each appoint an "expert" to try to agree on the terms of settlement of the oil controversy. Appendix B, a little over two pages, is a letter from the two experts, Morris L. Cooke and Manuel J. Zevada, to Franklin D. Roosevelt and Manuel Avila Camacho, informing the Presidents of their countries that they have come to an agreement, the complete terms of which are included in the brief letter. In between these initial and terminal documents is the long labor of investigation and negotiation, the nature of which is set forth in the body of this book. Harlow S. Person, listing himself as a Consultant in Business Economics and Management, headed the research staff of our experts and prepared this report not merely for Cooke but for the information of an unnamed but easily identified "executive."

The report is tightly constructed, charged with information, the distillation of a great deal of investigation and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thought on the economics and politics of the controversy and the entire background out of which it developed.

Recent history is full of such conflicts as this one. They have followed a monotonous course predictable as to outcome if not as to details: the appeal of a foreign company to its own government; the representation of Ambassador or State Department acting as the agent of the company; diplomatic pressure, non-recognition, non-intercourse, support to opposition forces within the country, military intervention; in the end the defiant "colonial" government backs down or is overthrown, and right, in the form of confirmation of the claims of the company, is triumphant. The present conflict is nearly four decades old and, for all but the last act, followed the usual course. But the dénouement is strikingly different.

As a matter of fact the conventions of the drama and even the setting in which it was taking place were shifting while the last act was in progress. On this continent we were moving uncertainly from the Big Neighbor to the Good Neighbor policy; on a world scale the imperialist doctrine of the right of the stronger was being pushed to new lengths in China, Ethiopia, Spain and Central Europe. The nagging oil controversy dragged on as the chief symbol of the old order and the chief obstacle to the continental unity that was becoming a burning necessity as war came nearer. Moreover, our boycott of Mexican oil was forcing Mexico to barter for oil with Italy and Germany. It was a combination of the broad doctrine of good-neighborliness and the narrower needs of the war itself which determined the unexpected and unprecedented end to the controversy.

The first innovation was the appointment of "experts" in place of the usual diplomatic career negotiators. They were not only charged with finding the facts: if they could harmonize their views, their agreement would be final and unappealable. They were instructed in vague but pregnant terms "not to take into account reasons of a technical nature . . . but common rules of justice and equity." How sweepingly they construed this obligation is evidenced by the scope of this astonishing report. It begins with a brief consideration of new trends in diplomacy: from secret to open negotiations, from dickering between diplomatic spokesmen of vested interests to attempts to consider "the global interests of the two peoples concerned." They saw their task as nothing less than that of "harmonizing two great social forces . . . Mexican and Anglo-Saxon traditions, institutions and laws."

To this end Mr. Person and his staff examined the background of Indian and Spanish and subsequent Mexican legal and property conceptions and the related cultural-historical factors which determined those conceptions. The report passes in review the Indian heritage of communal property relations, the Spanish doctrine of the Sovereign's retention of property in the subsoil wealth, the passage of this *dominium directum* to the nation when it won its independence, the scope and legality of the acts of Porfirio Díaz under which the oil companies claimed it had been alienated, the Mexican Revolution as a process of reasserting popular control of the subsoil wealth, the terms of the various conflicting laws and constitutional provisions, the changing character of the conflicts between the companies and the Mexican nation, the charges of labor and Mexican government against the companies, the latter's charges against labor and government, our own government's far from exemplary record, the tangible or technical and the intangible or moral premises which had to be harmonized before a mutual agreement on the size of compensatory payments could be attempted.

The final agreement follows the famous Latin American Calvo doctrine that a company wishing privileges in any land must accept the laws of that land and not appeal against them to its government. The Mexican expert in turn agreed to stretch a point or two in favor of giving some compensation for oil not yet captured but within reach of a live well, and even token payments for partial drillings and partially proved areas. The amount fixed is considerably more than would have accrued if the Mexican valuation law had been strictly followed, but the final sum of $23,995,991 (most of which goes to Standard of New Jersey and Standard of California) is far below the company claims of $200,000,000. Both governments have accepted the terms; how the oil companies feel the report sayeth not.

With understandable caution the original instruction to the experts states that it is not to be considered as a precedent for the settlement of future controversies. But having turned out successfully and being in accord with a spirit abroad in our

THE BOOK CLUB
for
NEW REPUBLIC READERS
presents:
BOOK FIND for JANUARY

"THE GREAT OFFENSIVE"

by Max Werner

Membership in the Book Find Club is simple: Once a month you receive a "Book Find" selection: if you accept it, you mail us one dollar in cash, check or money order; if you do not accept it, return it by mail within 3 days. No club dues nor annual fees! Start your membership today!

•

PAST BOOK FINDS

"Sensation Fair," by Ergon Kisch
"Dawn Breaks," by F. C. Weiskof
"Village in August," by Tien Chun
"Only the Stars Are Neutral," by Quentin Reynolds
"The Edge of the Sword," by Vladimir Pozner

BOOK FIND CLUB
112 East 19th Street
New York City, Dept. NR

Please enroll me as a member. I will pay $1 for "The Great Offensive," and for each selection I accept thereafter. I agree to purchase a minimum of 4 books per year.

Name .....
Address .....
City & State .....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

times, it is likely to create a significant precedent. Mexico, and with her all of Latin America, still nourishes the doubt whether the precedent can survive our war exigencies and a future change of administrations. I venture to believe that it will, since the viewpoints on which it is based, until recently only the property of a liberal minority who urged them in season and out of season, are increasingly becoming a part of the consciousness of our people. This little book's importance lies in the fact that the publication of what was originally intended as a private report will substantially contribute to the strengthening of that consciousness. By any standard, Mr. Person's report to "an executive" makes exciting and illuminating reading for all of us.

BERTRAM D. WOLFE

A Reader's List

FRENCH PRICE CONTROL, by Louis Franck (Brookings, 50 cents). This study, covering the French experience in price control between 1936 and 1941, provides a timely warning, for the French experience during this period, when the cost of living—despite efforts to keep it down—shot up nearly 125 percent, is a disturbingly close parallel to our own to date. The French attempted, as we are still attempting, to curb inflation by dealing chiefly with its symptoms, rising prices and neglecting its cause, excess purchasing power. No attempt was made, for example, to neutralize unequal purchasing power with a strict and comprehensive rationing program. As a result, price policies and price ceilings were subject to continual pressure from consumers and particularly from agricultural and business interests wanting more favored treatment. Inevitably, these pressures won out and can now be seen operating in a widespread black market. The conclusion that "the problem of general price control cannot be approached on the basis of group interests" is one that should be taken to heart here, before it is too late.

LET THE PEOPLE KNOW, by Norman Angell (Viking, $2.50). "If this book has a single text," says the author, "it is that two wars have come upon us in a single generation because we have forgotten the elementary social truth that the right of each to life must be defended collectively, by the community, or it cannot be defended at all." Sir Norman makes that point in words that are a model of plain and persuasive exposition. But the book in fact has a triple text. It argues also: (a) That the problem of political organization must be solved before we can tackle the economic causes of war, and (b) that, in effect, British "imperialism" is simply a fiction. Despite the author's unquestioned belief in the necessity of having the law that is invoked against aggressor nations sanctioned by public opinion, his argument for putting all emphasis now on the political arrangements parallels the tragic and deadly Wilsonian fallacy. In expounding the second contention, he presents information about the British Commonwealth which Anglophobes should *read every night at bedtime, alone with their God*; but in seeming to believe that the only reason Britain has for years wanted her colonies is to prevent aggressor nations from seizing them to the detriment of all of us, he puts a pretty heavy strain on faith.

Contributors

MAX WERNER's most recent book, "The Great Offensive: The Strategy of Coalition Warfare," was published last fall by Viking.

FERNANDO DE LOS RIOS, former Minister of Education and Ambassador from Spain to the United States, is now a professor of Political Science at the New School for Social Research in New York City.

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN is the author, among other books, of "Education Between Two Worlds," which was reviewed in our November 9 issue. His paper, "Education as a Factor in Post-War Reconstruction," appears in the January issue of Free World.

HANS KOHN, Sydenham Clark Parsons Professor of History at Smith College, visiting lecturer in Government at Harvard University and Radcliffe College, is the author, among other books, of "World Order in Historical Perspective."

DIANA TRILLING contributes to The New Republic, The Nation and other magazines.

BERTRAM D. WOLFE is the author of "Portrait of America," "Portrait of Mexico," in collaboration with Diego Rivera, and "Diego Rivera: His Life and Times."

A DINNER-FORUM ON

India's Place in the Democratic World

Speakers:

PEARL BUCK LOUIS FISCHER SYUD HOSSAIN

WALTER REUTHER WILLIAM SHIRER

Toastmaster: ROGER N. BALDWIN

On India Independence Day, Tuesday, January 26, 7:30 P.M.

Grand Ballroom, Hotel Biltmore, Madison Ave. & 43rd Street

Auspices: INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA

For reservations ($3.50 per plate) write or phone Mrs. John Gunther, Chairman, Committee of Sponsors, 8 West 40th Street, LAckawanna 4-2520

TRANSLATING—TUTORING

SPANISH. Writer recently returned from South America desires translating Spanish-English or tutoring in Spanish. Tel. CHelsea 3-1682.

HANDWRITING ANALYSIS

PROFESSIONAL, comprehensive evaluation of character, qualities, potentialities from handwriting. $5.00. Alfred Reiss, Ph.D., 680 Ft. Washington Ave., N. Y. C.

BOOKS

The Story of an American Sailor Aboard a Death Ship

The most exciting and sensational sea story of this time. Unexpurgated and unabridged edition. Cloth bound. Library size. Of the eighteen editions already printed this is the only authentic one. Two dollars (U. S. Cy.) No cash permitted, only postal orders or checks. (The plates of the book have been turned over to the U. S. Govt. There will be no new printing for the duration.)

CASA M. L. MARTINEZ
Apartado 2520 Mexico City

LANGUAGES

SPANISH by LINGUAPHONE

The quick, easy, correct way to speak any of 29 languages. World famous Linguaphone Ear-Eye method brings voices of native teachers *into your own home.* *Send for FREE Book*

LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
86 R.C.A. Building New York City

BARGAIN PHONOGRAPH COURSE. All Makes. Mail Orders. Booklet R. LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 East 41st Street, New York City.

Classified Rates: **6 point type (6 words to the line), 50c a type line; 5 point type (7 words to the line), 45c a type line. Minimum ad 3 lines.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED